UNITED NATIONS

SECURITY COUNCIL
OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-EIGHTH YEAR

2415th MEETING: 22 FEBRUARY 1983

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2415)	1
Expression of welcome to the representative of Jordan	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
Letter dated 19 February 1983 from the Permanent Representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/15615)	1

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/ . . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements* of the *Official Records of the Security Council*. The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*. The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

Held in New York on Tuesday, 22 February 1983, at noon

President: Mr. Oleg Aleksandrovich TROYANOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics).

Present: The representatives of the following States: China, France, Guyana, Jordan, Malta, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Poland, Togo, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zaire, Zimbabwe.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2415)

1. Adoption of the agenda

2. Letter dated 19 February 1983 from the Permanent Representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/15615)

The meeting was called to order at 12.35 p.m.

Expression of welcome to the representative of Jordan

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): I should like at the outset of this meeting to extend a warm welcome to Mr. Abdullah Salah, the new representative of Jordan. We wish him every possible success and look forward to the same close co-operation with him that we enjoyed with his predecessor, Mr. Nuseibeh.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Letter dated 19 February 1983 from the Permanent Representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/15615)

2. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Benin, Democratic Yemen, Egypt, Ghana, The Islamic Republic of Iran, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, the Sudan and the Syrian Arab Republic in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Treiki (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) took a place at the Council table; Mr. Soglo (Benin), Mr. Al-Ashtal (Democratic Yemen), Mr. Khalil (Egypt), Mr. Hayford (Ghana), Mr. Rajaie-Khorassani (Islamic Republic of Iran), Mr. Abdalla (Sudan) and Mr. El-Fattal (Syrian Arab Republic) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

3. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): The Council is meeting today in response to the request made by the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya in his letter dated 19 February.

4. Members of the Council also have before them document S/15614, which contains the text of a letter dated 18 February from the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya to the President of the Council. I should like to inform members that I have received a letter dated 22 February from the representative of the United States, which will be circulated during the course of this meeting as document S/15617.

5. The first speaker is the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, upon whom I now call.

6. Mr. TREIKI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (*interpretation from Arabic*): Allow me at the outset, Sir, on behalf of the delegation of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya to extend to you warm congratulations on your presidency for this month. We are pleased to see you presiding over the Council, since you represent a friendly country with which we are bound by strong ties: a responsible super-Power known for its support for the struggle of peoples against colonialism and for the causes of liberation and independence. We are pleased also because of your wide political experience, your wisdom and your effectiveness, which eminently qualify you for this responsibility.

7. I wish also to extend to my colleague and friend, Mr. Amega of Togo, our appreciation for the diplomatic expertise with which he conducted the work of the Council last month.

8. Through you, Mr. President, I should like to extend my thanks and gratitude to the members of the Council for giving me this opportunity to speak before this body. As this is my first statement before the Council this year I express my country's appreciation for the adoption of the resolution introducing Arabic as an official working language of the Council [*resolution 528 (1982)*]. It is an acknowledgement of the importance and role of Arabic

READEX FICHE

here at the United Nations and is also a token of appreciation for the Arab people.

9. I welcome my colleague the representative of Jordan and wish him every success. I also welcome the States that have acceded to membership of the Council this year: Malta, the Netherlands, Nicaragua, Pakistan and Zimbabwe.

10. The American threats and provocations against the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya that we are witnessing today are neither a matter of coincidence nor transient in nature, but represent an established and deliberate aggressive policy that has been pursued since 1969, following the Great 1 September Revolution. Until then, as everyone knows, Libya in its entirety had been an aggressive military base of the United States, there being five American bases spread over the country, the most important of which was Willis—the largest American base outside the United States at the time. Moreover, American monopolies used to control the Libyan economy—especially the oil sector—and used it in their own interest. With the Revolution and an end to the puppet régime of the American Administration a new phase in the history of the Libyan people and of the Arab nation began: the aggressive American bases were evacuated, an end was put to the oil monopolies in the area, and Libya pursued a policy of economic emancipation and the nationalization of the oil resources in the interest of the people of the region, in particular, and of oil-producing nations, in general.

11. Neither the Revolution's support for our African brothers, for the liberation movements in southern Africa and for the struggle of the Palestinian people, nor Libya's pursuit of a non-aligned, anti-racist, anti-Zionist and anti-colonialist policy is acceptable to the United States, the leader of international terrorism; hence the process of threats, provocation and direct and indirect aggression against Libya, from the aggressive act by the Sadat régime, incited by the United States, and his waging of war against Libya in 1977, to the act of direct aggression in the Gulf of Sidra in August 1981, in addition to the economic boycott designed to starve the Libyan people, not to mention the prejudiced media campaign, economic pressures and the inciting of other States to be hostile to the Jamahiriya. The United States Administration's aggressive policy against the Libyan people and its policy of terrorism are assuming daily ever-wider forms and manifestations.

12. In the past Libya has repeatedly notified the Council and the Secretary-General of such acts of aggression and terrorism pursued by the United States authorities against our country. The United States Sixth Fleet in the Mediterranean has been violating Libyan territorial waters and airspace. By way of example we refer to the following correspondence with the United Nations.

13. First, in a letter dated 30 May 1973, addressed to the President of the Council [*S/10939*], it was specifically reported that on 21 March an American C-130 military aircraft had violated Libyan airspace for the purpose of reconnaissance and spying. In the letter it is stated that on 30 April an American aircraft carrier of the Sixth Fleet which was based near the Libyan coast had spied on the Libyan Air Force and jammed Libyan communications. Moreover, a wave of United States military aircraft had been launched from the carrier to interfere with Libyan training flights in the area.

14. Secondly, the annex to a letter dated 1 August 1980, addressed to the President of the Security Council [*S/14094*], contained the following list of violations of Libyan airspace by United States aircraft:

1975 — One violation on 18 October.

1977 — Eight violations, seven over the north of Tripoli: one on 28 January, two on 11 April and four on 18 April; one violation over the north of Benghazi.

1978 — Seven violations, five north of Tripoli: one on 12 February, three on 11 March and one on 12 March; two violations north of Tobruk on 7 December.

1979 — Six violations north of Tripoli: 3 February, 15 March, 12 June and 6, 19 and 30 July.

1980 — Up until June of that year, 135 violations: 103 north of Tripoli, 6 north of Sidra and 26 north of Benghazi.

— Violations north of Tripoli: one on 19 February, one on 22 February, two on 24 February, one on 25 February, one on 26 February and two on 2 March.

15. Thirdly, in a letter dated 20 August 1981, addressed to the President of the Council [*S/14636*], it was stated that on 19 August at 0512 (GMT) eight American aircraft of the United States Sixth Fleet which were part of American forces conducting manoeuvres near Libyan shores had intercepted two Libyan Arab Air Force aircraft while they were conducting reconnaissance duties in Libyan airspace. Those Libyan aircraft were attacked by American aircraft. That act of aggression was condemned by the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, the Organization of the Islamic Conference and the Group of Arab States.

16. Fourthly, in a letter dated 3 February 1982, addressed to the Secretary-General [*S/14860*], in which it was stated that on 31 January at 1422 (GMT) two American F-14 jet fighters from the United States Sixth Fleet had intercepted a Libyan airliner, a Boeing 727 belonging to the Libyan Arab Airlines, on its regular flight from Tripoli to Athens. The two American fighters had carried on acrobatic provocative manoeuvres against the Libyan commercial plane, following it over a distance of 11 kilometres. That incident had occurred in international airspace within the Greek Aviation Information Area, about 48 kilometres south-west of the Greek island of Paleo Hora, penetrating the international air route known as "B-1", above the Libyan Arab Airlines aircraft.

17. On 5 February 1982 *The New York Times* stated that Greece had lodged a complaint with the United States for the above-mentioned violation of Greek airspace, which constituted an act of aggression against and a detriment to Libyan economic interests.

18. There have been many recent violations of Libyan territorial waters. On 31 December 1982 three violations occurred in the Sidra region. On 19 January 1983 two violations occurred in the Benghazi region.

19. The latest event in the series of United States provocations and threats against the Libyan Jamahiriya have been actions of the American AWACS, which have been constantly spying along the eastern region of Libya. Those actions have resulted in the obstruction and jamming of civil communication. On 13 February the United States aircraft-carrier *Nimitz* and some vessels accompanying it approached the Libyan coast near the Gulf of Sidra. On 16 February, 13 violations of the airspace occurred in the Sidra area.

20. On 17 February some naval vessels of the United States Sixth Fleet approached the limit of the territorial waters 22 kilometres from latitude 32. In addition to the dispatch of AWACS to a neighbouring country for the purpose of using them for espionage and obstruction of our civil communication.

21. Last week United States Defense Department officials stated that the movements of the American Sixth Fleet and AWACS were related to the so-called Libyan mobilization on the borders of the Sudan with a view to interfering in that country's affairs and that those movements, especially those of the AWACS, were for the purpose of joint manoeuvres with Egyptian forces.

22. Following those developments the Egyptian Government denied the presence of any joint manoeuvres. *The Christian Science Monitor* of 18 February stated that Egyptian officials had claimed to have no knowledge of a recent Libyan military build-up against the Sudan. They also denied reports by the United States Defense Department that Egyptian troops were in a state of alert. That shows the falsehood of the American allegations.

23. In addition, there are the discrepancies between statements on the subject by the United States Departments of State and Defense and by the White House and even the President of the United States. Those discrepancies add to the ambiguities concerning the presence of AWACS in Egypt, as stated in *The Washington Post* of 18 February.

24. In this regard I should like to refer to the fact that the leader of the September Revolution has affirmed that no forces were mobilized on the borders with Sudan and Egypt; that the Jamahiriya has no desire to interfere in the affairs of Egypt, the Sudan or any other State; and that the Jamahiriya is a small country which desires to live in peace.

25. It is clear from this that the United States wants to fabricate pretexts to interfere in the affairs of the States of the area and incite them against each other under the policy of divide and rule so as to impose its hegemony and control on the peoples of the area and compel them to acquiesce in United States policy. It is also trying to subjugate the peoples of the area to the desires of the racists in occupied Palestine and southern Africa.

26. The aim of the United States is clear. As stated in *The New York Times* of 22 February, "The plan, according to American officials, was to lure Libya into striking and then to destroy as much of its air force as possible."* That was the United States plan.

27. United States acts of aggression have not been limited to acts of military provocation but include prejudiced media campaigns against the Jamahiriya. The United States Administration is feeding this campaign with false information by American officials and deliberate distortions, such as describing Libyan assistance to internationally recognized liberation movements as assistance to international terrorism. We refer also to the so-called assassination squad which was fabricated by the United States Administration and for which it could find no proof. That squad existed only in the imagination of some United States officials.

28. Former Secretary of State Haig accused the Jamahiriya of being responsible for the Sadat assassination. But the Egyptian Government itself has stated that the assassination of Sadat was strictly internal and had no connection with any other country. That accusation was an attempt by the United States Administration to incite Libya's neighbours against it.

29. The aim of the United States Administration was to prepare American and world public opinion for its acts of aggression against the Jamahiriya. Actually, the current United States Administration closed the people's office in Washington in May 1981; that was followed by punitive economic measures. On 11 March 1982 the United States Administration imposed an embargo on the import of Libyan oil and the export of tractors, aircraft, aircraft equipment and technical information. It also requested United States citizens working in the oil sector or with American firms in the Jamahiriya to leave that country. It requested United States citizens not to travel to the Jamahiriya, under the pretext of concern for their safety, in spite of the fact that there had been no incidents and that a pledge had been made to respect them, like any other foreigner working in Libya.

30. Provocations, threats and acts of aggression against Libya are nothing new; they fall within the United States strategy of intervention in the affairs of States which refuse to acquiesce in its policies and colonialist interests.

31. It is an open secret that the United States intervenes in the internal affairs of States all over the world. In Asia,

* Quoted in English by the speaker.

the United States waged a war of aggression against the Vietnamese people that ended in the defeat of the United States.

32. We all know of its continued intervention in Korea's affairs, the latest being those aggressive manoeuvres a few weeks ago in which more than 70,000 American soldiers participated, designed to threaten North Korea and destabilize the area.

33. The United States also intervened in the affairs of the Iranian people, overthrew the patriotic Government of Mossadegh and imposed a puppet régime in 1953, supported the dictatorship of the Shah and provided it with all means of torture through its intelligence. However, the struggling Iranian people triumphed and the American influence ended. The United States did not despair; it went on working, through its lackeys, against the Iranian Revolution, to undermine the régime, and it launched an act of direct aggression against Iran's sovereignty. It is now trying to prolong the war between Iran and Iraq in order to smash the Iranian Revolution and debilitate and distract Iraq from its national goal of confronting the Zionist enemy, the ally of America.

34. In Latin America, acting from the viewpoint that that region falls within the American sphere of influence, the United States undermined unity there when it partitioned Greater Colombia.

35. In 1963 the United States dispatched 23,000 soldiers to the Dominican Republic and imposed a pro-American Government.

36. The United States became hostile to Cuba once its lackey, the dictator Batista, was overthrown and once there was a revolution which rebuffed American domination. The United States tried to invade Cuba several times, the most important attempt being the so-called Bay of Pigs invasion, and when it failed the United States made several attempts to assassinate President Castro through the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) and laid political and economic siege to Cuba.

37. In 1954 it intervened in Guatemala and imposed a Government to its own liking.

38. In Chile it overthrew the legally elected Government in 1973 and assassinated President Salvador Allende. As the facts have shown, Kissinger personally planned this operation, which was implemented by the CIA.

39. In Nicaragua the United States Administration supported the feudal, oppressive régime of the dictator Somoza, which conformed to American interests. The United States Administration tried to prolong the life of that régime although it was aware of its violations of human rights. Since that régime was overthrown, this Administration has financed and plotted terrorism against the people of Nicaragua. Here I would recall that the Co-ordinator of the Council of the Government of National Reconstruction declared in a recent statement before the Ministerial Meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Non-Aligned Countries held at Managua from 10 to 14 January that the CIA was behind all the military operations waged against his country and that it was using the neighbouring countries as springboards in implementing its plans for further intervention in the internal affairs of Nicaragua [*see S/15628, annex, appendix I*].

40. The United States Administration tries persistently to stop the winds of change in Latin America through the destruction of progressive régimes; it uses all means to achieve its ends and to support those régimes loyal to it, as in the case of El Salvador and other countries.

41. In Africa the United States Administration supports and is allied with the racist régime in South Africa. It supports that régime militarily, economically and politically. It obstructs the achievement by Namibia of its independence and tries to implant its military bases there. It combats progressive régimes and hatches plots to assassinate African leaders; this happened in the Congo, where President Lumumba was assassinated by the CIA.

42. The United States has shirked all its responsibilities as a major Power that is a permanent member of the Security Council. It has pursued international terrorism and is indeed at the vanguard of that terrorism, which is part of the daily conduct of its policy. The purpose of the widespread American military bases and the presence of American naval fleets all over the world is only to terrorize peoples and protect colonial monopolies and the racist and Zionist régimes as everyone well knows. The CIA has waged organized terrorism through assassinating national leaders, as happened to Allende in Chile and Lumumba in the Congo, in addition to the attempts to assassinate President Castro and Colonel Qaddafi, as well as the assassination of American black leaders like Martin Luther King and Malcolm X. And all of this is in addition to the organized sabotage conducted by the CIA in many countries throughout the world. The present Administration has supported this terrorist agency, increased appropriations for it and given it new powers to undertake widespread sabotage in different regions of the world and inside the United States.

43. *The New York Times* of 16 January published an article in its magazine section in which it stated that at a moment when the Reagan Administration is forcing most Government agencies to retrench, the CIA and its fellow intelligence organizations are enjoying boom times. With a budget increase of 25 per cent for 1983 as compared with the previous year, this is the fastest growing major agency in the Federal Government. The article goes on to say that the Agency has invested vast sums of money in the technology of intelligence, including communications-intercept stations and computers. There were also revelations about dirty tricks, drug experimentation, surveillance of American citizens and a long string of other abuses.

44. The CIA conducted extensive domestic spying during the 1960s and early 1970s under the pretext of gathering foreign intelligence information.

45. *The New York Times* goes on to describe the Agency's actions, saying that the record of its covert actions is replete with daring actions, among which have been attempts at assassination, participation in *coups d'état* in a number of countries and the training of specialized security forces to protect a select group of foreign leaders, as well as the provision of funds and equipment to rebels against the nationalist Governments, as was the case in Nicaragua and Iran.

46. The recent actions of the United States confirm the grave danger posed by the American terrorist policy to international peace and security and to the freedom and independence of peoples. The United States claim that there is a Libyan threat against Libya's neighbours cannot but be the object of ridicule and contempt by the international community. The States concerned themselves confirm the falsity of the American allegations, and even if we assumed that differences actually existed between Libya and its neighbours, what business can it be of the United States? The United States is not the Security Council, nor is it the policeman of the world. Instead of working for pacification and calling upon neighbours to come to agreement, it has resorted to the policy of creating discord and provocation. The allegation of the United States Administration that some Arab States are friendly to the United States is without basis. America's only friend in the region is Israel. The United States Administration, which established a strategic alliance with the Zionist entity, realizes that all Arab peoples are against it. Regardless of differences of opinion among the Arab Governments, the United States Administration will always be the chief enemy of the Arab nation and the ally of the Zionist entity. Libya is a part of the Arab nation and shares the hopes and aspirations of the Arab nation. If there are any temporary differences among some Arab States, these will disappear. The only danger to the Arab nation is that posed by the Zionist entity, supported by the United States, and the aggressive policy of the United States in the region. The occupation of Palestine and other Arab territories, the raid against the Iraqi nuclear reactor and the occupation of Lebanon could not have happened without the support of the United States Administration for aggression and its pursuit of a policy of terrorism.

47. We are a small, peace-loving people. We want to build up our country and to contribute to the unity of our nation. We want peace and security. We are eminently qualified to understand the meaning of peace and security. We lost more than half our people in a war against the Italian Fascist invasion, a bitter war that lasted more than 20 years. Our people, which liberated the country from the colonialist American bases and liberated its economy and made great strides in development, will protect its development and achievements regardless of the price, even if it means sacrificing half its population as it did in the past; we will not be intimidated by the forces of aggression or by aircraft carriers.

48. History repeats itself. In 1805 the United States invaded Libya. We repulsed the aggression and captured the cruiser *Philadephia*, under the command of Captain Bainbridge. The same year we repulsed a land invasion, in which the United States had enlisted mercenaries from Western Sahara, under General Eaton, the then Consul General of the United States in Tunis.

49. Our people will fight regardless of the circumstances and regardless of the sacrifices, if war and aggression are imposed upon it.

50. The Security Council, which has the responsibility for maintaining security in the world, must shoulder that responsibility, especially when one of its permanent members violates the Charter of the United Nations and jeopardizes international peace and security. Although we are convinced of the good will of most of its members, we know that the Council will be unable to adopt any effective measure, in view of its structure. However, the Council must face its responsibility and condemn the aggression. What happened to Libya may happen to other States—indeed it has already happened to others in the past—unless an end is put to the arrogance of cynicism of the United States Administration, its intervention in the internal affairs of States and its threat to international peace and security.

51. We are a small, non-aligned people. We want to have relations with everybody based on mutual respect and non-intervention, including the United States of America. We have tried in the past, and we are prepared at present, to hold a dialogue and discuss any problems with the United States Administration, if such problems exist. But that Administration consistently rejects the policy of dialogue and opts for that of domination, which we reject regardless of the sacrifices.

52. Finally, I wish to tell the United States Administration that the policy of intervention and aggression will only militate against the interests of peace and security and those of the United States itself. Peoples, no matter how small and weak, cannot accept humiliation and colonialism, and if they are doomed to die they will die on their feet.

53. Mrs. KIRKPATRICK (United States of America): I should like to begin, Sir, by taking advantage of this first opportunity offered me at a formal meeting to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency. Also, I should like to welcome personally—since I am not certain whether it has already been done by my delegation during my absence—the representatives of the new members of the Council, Malta, the Netherlands, Nicaragua, Pakistan and Zimbabwe, and express our firm and clear desire to work with them on the Council in the search for international peace and security. Similarly, I wish to welcome our new colleague from Jordan, Mr. Salah, whose contributions will, I hope, be as substantial as those of his distinguished predecessor, our good friend Mr. Nuseibeh.

54. Mr. President, on behalf of my Government I have today addressed the following letter to you for circulation as an official document of the Security Council:

"The Government of the United States rejects the false and malicious charges of the Government of Libya and calls the attention of the Security Council to yet another example of a threat to international peace and security posed by the policies of the Libyan Government.

"Furious that its plans for illegal, violent action were frustrated, the Government of Libya comes now to the Council with lying complaints against the United States. In fact, the United States committed none of the acts charged by the Government of Libya.

"The United States dispatched no offensive aircraft into the region, violated no Libyan airspace. As a matter of fact, neither the United States carrier *Nimitz* nor its aircraft entered water or airspace claimed by Libya on the days in question, although we have every right to enter these international waters, recognized as such under international law. We also have every right to conduct, under appropriate circumstances, training exercises with friendly Governments.

"The United States affirms its rights under international law and the Charter of the United Nations and intends to exercise them.

"Naturally, the Government of Libya would prefer that no obstacles—however legal—be interposed to its plots and expansionist projects. But peace-loving nations cannot accommodate Libya's designs on its neighbours.

"In calling attention to Libya's false charges, the United States notes that such lies mock the serious work of building international peace, just as Libya's repeated efforts to interfere in the affairs of its neighbours destroy security in the region." [*S/15617.*]

55. The United States did not seek this confrontation in the Security Council with the Government of Libya. But we welcome the opportunity thus presented to put facts on the record—not fabrications of Colonel Qaddafi's spokesman—and to assign responsibility for this grave threat to international peace and security where that responsibility belongs.

56. I speak, of course, of the Government of Qaddafi's Libya and I wish to put this threat, which seems for the moment to have receded, in the context of the pattern of Libyan-sponsored world-wide terrorism and adventurism directed against its neighbours—indeed, throughout northern, eastern and central Africa. This pattern of lawless expansionism constitutes a continuing threat to peace and security in the region and beyond.

57. My Government and the American people have never sought, and do not now seek, any confrontation with the Government or the people of Libya. We have never engaged, and do not now engage, in acts of provocation. But we are deeply sensitive to threats to international peace, to our own security and to the security and national independence of Libya's neighbours. And let there be no doubt: we will respond, as appropriate, to Libyan threats.

58. Briefly, I wish to recall the salient events that led to this situation. Last Friday, 18 February, official Sudanese Radio announced the discovery of a Libyan-backed coup plot against the Government of President Gaafar Nimeiri. It announced the arrest of Libyan-sponsored dissidents and infiltrators. It also reported that the Government of Sudan had been closely watching concentrations of Libyan bombers and fighter aircraft in south-east Libya, close to the Sudanese and Egyptian borders. This concentration of Libyan aircraft had been of particular concern to the Sudanese.

59. In view of the successful steps which the Sudan has now taken to deal with this latest Libyan effort to destabilize one of its neighbours, we are now able to put the spotlight of world attention on events in the region. We follow Qaddafi's irresponsible intrusions into the affairs of his neighbours closely and with deep concern. We had been aware for some time of his efforts directed against President Nimeiri. We were also aware of the concentrations of Libyan aircraft which were of concern to the Sudanese and the Egyptians. Because of the situation, we moved up the date of an already-scheduled AWACS training exercise—scheduled for about a month hence—and sent our AWACS and tanker aircraft into Egypt. We have also had United States naval forces deployed in the eastern Mediterranean. Their presence in international waters sometimes seems to have a deterring effect on Libyan adventurism in the region.

60. The desire result seems to have been achieved—at least for the present. The statement on Sudanese Radio and yesterday's statement by the Sudanese Assembly speak for themselves. We can be reassured by the bold and decisive manner in which the Sudanese dealt with the threat of Libyan expansionism.

61. Fortunately, the most recent threat has receded. But the pattern of Libyan misconduct is long-standing. Colonel Qaddafi conducts a virulent, hostile foreign policy which respects the territorial integrity, national independence, right to peace and security and self-determination of no one. Because of a relative lack of conventional military power, Colonel Qaddafi has tried to accomplish his goals through a combination of economic and military aid to radical Governments, bribery of officials, help to international terrorists by providing sanctuary, funds, weapons and planning, assassination of exiled opponents and planned assassination of target Government officials, and assistance to guerrilla groups working to overthrow established Governments.

62. The Qaddafi régime has been engaged in these activities almost since it took power. For example, in 1972, Libya provided sanctuary to the perpetrators of the Munich Olympics murders. Qaddafi also gave refuge to

the terrorists who had taken 60 hostages at the 1975 Vienna meeting of the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries. Libya has been used as a safe area in which terrorist groups have planned acts to be committed in many of Europe's capitals. The infamous Carlos has operated out of Libya over several years. The weapons found on the French terrorists Bréguet and Kopp had been sold to the Libyan army. It was their release that Carlos had demanded.

63. Assassination has been an important Libyan tool. The proof of Libya's utilization of this tool is not hard to come by. The 1980-1981 murders of a dozen exiled Libyans, primarily in Western Europe's capitals, has been reported by the international press in detail. Less widely known are a 1975 plot to murder the Prime Minister of a neighbouring country, plans to kill American ambassadors in several Middle Eastern countries and at least one European capital, and a November 1981 attempt to plant explosives in the American Embassy Club in Khartoum—explosives which were concealed in stereo speakers designed to detonate on a Saturday evening when scores of people would have been present and killed.

64. A major fact of Libyan foreign policy has been and remains subversion and destabilization of moderate independent Government in the Middle East, Africa and elsewhere. Chad has been a recent principal victim of the aggressive policies of Libya. Currently, Libyan intentions towards Chad are a major concern. Colonel Qaddafi has brought large numbers of Chadian followers to Libya, trained and equipped them, and is moving them into the northern parts of Chad. Other efforts to increase his own strength in that area are under way. Most disturbing was the mid-January deployment of a dozen Libyan SU-22 ground attack fighters to the Aouzou air base in northern Chad, apparently in preparation for a Libyan option to provide air cover for an assault by dissidents and infiltrators against the Chadian Government and Chadian-held population centres.

65. A Libyan team of approximately 80 advisers in another African republic may be assisting anti-Government Chadians there.

66. Libya has a long record of training guerrillas, supplying weapons, and plotting the subversion and destabilization of its north African neighbours. In the Horn of Africa, Libya continues to try to overthrow the Governments of the Sudan and Somalia. A number of Libyans are in Ethiopia advising Somali and Sudanese guerrillas. Libyan aircraft and ships continue to train guerrillas, supply arms, ammunition, explosives and *matériel* to the Somali Salvation Front and the Sudanese rebels. Also, Libya's deliveries of increasingly advanced weapons to warring tribes in the Sudan have contributed to death and violence in that region.

67. Elsewhere, Libya delivers military equipment and is involving itself increasingly, for example, in this hemisphere, always on behalf of military dictatorships, always opposed to democratic régimes and movements.

68. There is the pattern of Libyan misconduct worldwide. It constitutes, as I have said, a grave threat to international peace and security. The culprit in this proceeding is indentified beyond any reasonable doubt or question.

67. What has happened to Libya may happen to other States, the representative of Libya has suggested. I should like to say that we hope so. We hope that what happened to Libya will happen to other States. We hope that all States with aggressive designs on their neighbours will be discouraged by the lawful response of others to desist from their unlawful plans. My Government rests its case on the factual record and its adherence to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations in the cause of international peace and security.

The meeting rose at 1.25 p.m.

Litho in United Nations, New York 00300 60205—August 1990—2,050

S/PV.2416th Meeting CIRCLE 01 Proof 01 Internal Composition AM VERYTYPER SYSTEM
Joe Akakpo-Martin NL 340 EXT. 3-2988 06/09/90 Due 00/0/90 FILE A DISK 033/34

UNITED NATIONS

SECURITY COUNCIL
OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-EIGHTH YEAR

2416th MEETING: 22 FEBRUARY 1983

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Page

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2416) 1

Adoption of the agenda 1

Letter dated 19 February 1983 from the Permanent Representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/15615) 1

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/...) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements* of the *Official Records of the Security Council*. The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*. The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

S/PV.2416th Meeting CIRCLE 01 Proof 01 Internal Composition 90-60397 AM VARITYPER SYSTEM
Joe Akakpo-Martin NL 340 EXT. 3-2988 06/09/90 Due 00/0/90 FILE A DISK 033/34

2416th MEETING

Held in New York on Tuesday, 22 February 1983, at 4 p.m.

President: Mr. Oleg Aleksandrovich TROYANOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics).

Present: The representatives of the following States: China, France, Guyana, Jordan, Malta, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Poland, Togo, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zaire, Zimbabwe.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2416)

1. Adoption of the agenda

2. Letter dated 19 February 1983 from the Permanent Representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/15615)

The meeting was called to order at 4.40 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Letter dated 19 February 1983 from the Permanent Representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/15615)

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): In accordance with the decision taken by the Council at the previous meeting [*2415th meeting*], I invite the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya to take a place at the Council table; I invite the representatives of Benin, Democratic Yemen, Egypt, Ghana, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Sudan and the Syrian Arab Republic to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Treiki (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) took a place at the Council table; Mr. Soglo (Benin), Mr. Al-Ashtal (Democratic Yemen), Mr. Khalil (Egypt), Mr. Hayford (Ghana), Mr. Rajaie-Khorassani (Islamic Republic of Iran), Mr. Abdalla (Sudan) and Mr. El-Fattal (Syrian Arab Republic) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

2. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): I should like to inform members of the Council that I have just received a letter, dated 22 February, from the representative of Benin addressed to the Secretary-General. The text of the letter will be circulated during the course of this meeting in document S/15618.

3. The first speaker is the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

4. Mr. EL-FATTAL (Syrian Arab Republic) *(interpretation from Arabic)*: The American people, who yesterday celebrated the birthday of their first President, George Washington, a man who, in the not so distant past, embodied the aspirations of the American people for the liquidation of colonialism in their own land, are witnessing new and wide-scale American military movements designed to undermine the territorial integrity of an Arab State with a view to enhancing American hegemony and expanding its sphere of influence in Africa, Asia and other parts of the world.

5. How ironic! While the American people celebrate the values and principles advocated by George Washington in favour of independence, liberation and self-determination, they once more witness their Government pursuing a policy in contravention of those principles and seeking through intimidation, the threat of force, and direct and indirect aggression, to contravene the sovereignty of States and the rights of their peoples. It is certain that the American people today see the chasm between the principles advocated by George Washington and the reality that prevails. The American people have, in our view, begun to realize the danger their Government's policy poses to their interests, on the one hand, and to international peace and security, on the other.

6. The Council is meeting for the second time in a month to hear peoples and Governments yearning for genuine independence and freedom registering their condemnation of the American policies which stem from a strategy aimed against the Arab people throughout its homeland.

7. After the aggression carried out against Lebanon and its occupation by proxy at the hands of the most vicious enemy of the Arabs, that is, the Zionists, we see American hands now extending to a young Arab State known for its glorious struggle against Fascist settler colonialism for half a century, since that colonialism resorted to all means to liquidate the Libyan Arab people physically. Then, following the Second World War, the imperialists attempted to undermine the unity of Libya,

to dismember its people and to distribute its natural resources among the old and the neo-colonialists. Libya and its Arab neighbours suffered the presence of foreign military bases on the land of Arab Libya, but eventually the Libyan people rejected this formal independence and thus the people's revolution broke out and did away with those bases. But the imperialists considered Libya's genuine independence, which stemmed from the revolution of 1 September and the solidarity of that revolution with all peoples in Africa, Asia and Latin America, to be a threat to their interests. Thus, the American imperialists began to fight against the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya by all means.

8. We have to take into account that the modern history of Libya is in fact a continuous struggle between the exploiting forces alien to the area and the African and Arab nationalist forces which feel that their interests are linked to those of the struggling peoples of the third world. Hence, world imperialism and its Zionist ally have plotted to frustrate the nationalist and liberation aspirations of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya. In order to camouflage this frenzied offensive, American imperialist circles have been waging blatant, misleading economic, political and media campaigns. Thus, Libya's legitimate support for national liberation movements in Africa and elsewhere is labelled as support for international terrorism, while the bloody Israeli aggression has been upgraded by American imperialism and those same circles to the highest level of international legitimacy.

9. We are participating in this discussion because we are convinced that the United States is now putting the final touches on the implementation of its schemes embodied in strategic alliances, whose implementation would be facilitated by striking at the aspirations of the Libyan people, its revolutionary institutions and progressive positions.

10. These American provocations and acts of aggression against the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, which have tended to multiply in the past two years, have drawn our attention to the following. First, they coincide with Washington's vicious military and economic offensives to reimpose its hegemony on the region as a whole through its naval fleets and air and land forces within the concept of strategic co-ordination among Washington, Tel Aviv and the Pretoria régime. Secondly, these direct American provocations by sea and air came on the heels of the Israeli occupation of Lebanon and the aggression against the Arab deterrence forces, which proves that these provocations fall within the context of Camp David and of a strategic alliance established to implement all the economic, geographical and political dimensions of Camp David. Thirdly, these provocations fall within the world-wide American policy aimed at creating tension at the international, regional, national and domestic levels within a geographical belt extending from Latin America to Asia. By way of example, it suffices to cite the plots hatched against Nicaragua, Cuba and other Latin American countries, the intensified aggression against the peoples of southern Africa and the imperialist onslaught against Asia and the Middle East, where Israel wreaks havoc in co-operation with Washington.

11. The Syrian Arab Republic is not afraid of American manoeuvres, be they in the form of rapid deployment forces or those that stem from the concept of the American-Israeli strategic alliance, because the Syrian Arab Republic, together with the other States of the Arab Front of Steadfastness and Confrontation, is resolved to defend Arab rights whenever, wherever and however they may be threatened.

12. The Syrian Arab Republic is certain that this latest threat to the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya is but another desperate attempt to subjugate the Arabs to the Camp David logic. As part of the Arab people, we have taken it upon ourselves to foil these threats regardless of the cost.

13. Finally, we urge the Council to consider the complaint by the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya with much concern and seriousness, since escalating American threats and the accompanying military manoeuvres, which are condemned by the Arab nations from the Gulf to the Ocean, carry within them the seeds of explosions jeopardizing world peace and security.

14. Today we heard a statement by the United States representative [*ibid.*] who affirmed once more that the United States will persist in the same policy: to lay siege to Libya, deprive it of the ability to defend itself and lure it into a battle in interests of a super-Power, the United States. Acknowledgement of this policy by United States officials is simply more evidence that the logic of force and the threat of force govern American policy, which, as the Council knows, must be confronted here in the Council. The Council must assume its full responsibilities, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, in order to deter the aggressor and put an end to the threat menacing the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and the entire region.

15. We call upon the Council to warn the parties to Camp David and their allies that their actions, lies and resort to Washington to protect them from the wrath of the Arab people, and the problems they have created for that people as a result of their compromising Arab and Palestinian rights and their squandering of those rights by departing from Arab consensus, will lead to their bearing the same responsibility already borne by the United States Government if they persist in implementing these suspect designs under the American umbrella.

16. Mr. TINOCO FONSECA (Nicaragua) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Mr. President, in conveying our greetings to you we would also like to welcome the new representative of Jordan and assure him of the co-operation and friendship of the Nicaraguan delegation—co-operation and friendship which characterize relations between our peoples.

17. We have met here to consider the complaint of the Government of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya regarding

the latest threat levelled against that country by the United States of America.

18. The Libyan representative, in his letter dated 19 February, urgently called for this meeting and drew our attention to

> "the provocative military actions of the United States Administration by moving its aircraft-carrier *Nimitz* with some naval vessels close to the Libyan coast and sending four AWACS aircraft to one of the neighbouring countries of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya to spy and work against Libya".

19. The attitudes adopted by the United States Government against the people and Government of Libya have become a part of contemporary history. The actions taken against that people have assumed a wide range of manifestations: abrasive and derogatory rhetoric against Libyan leaders, destabilization plans, zealous and interminable international propaganda campaigns, attempts at economic blockades and technology boycotts, and threats and acts of military aggression.

20. The Co-ordinating Bureau of the Non-Aligned Countries, in an extraordinary meeting held in New York on 28 August 1981, declared, in regard to the events which were taking place at that time:

> "This action by the United States against Libya, which resulted in two Libyan surveillance aircraft being shot down by United States naval forces, represents a new event in a series of threats and provocations by the authorities of the United States which have been broadly covered by the press."

21. Similarly, in view of these events, the Group of Arab States adopted a declaration of support which was circulated as an official document of the Council [*S/14638/Rev.1*]; the relevant part reads as follows:

> "The Group of Arab States . . . in declaring its total solidarity with Libya, calls on all international groups, especially the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, to stand fast in the face of the provocations and challenges that constitute a most dangerous precedent in international relations, particularly when such a challenge is issued by a major Power which, as a permanent member of the Security Council, carries a special and definitive responsibility to maintain international peace and security."

22. History is once again repeating itself. Fortunately, so far the consequences have been less grave. What is disquieting, however, is the repetition of the aggressive attitude which seems to ignore or disregard the fundamental principle embodied in Article 2, paragraph 4, of the Charter of the United Nations Charter, which, *inter alia*, calls upon us to "refrain . . . from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State".

23. This history of slander and hostility against Libya is today taking on a special character because even the United States press has assumed the task of casting doubt on the validity of the reasons underlying the United States military mobilization. The facts show that there has been no threat to the Sudan. No United States official has brought forward concrete facts which prove such a claim. High-ranking Egyptian military officers, according to the international press, have denied being aware of any such threats, and some officials of the same Government have gone so far as to reject the existence of such a threat.

24. How, then, can we explain this deployment of military forces? How can we explain this political attitude?

25. In view of this latest incident, and at the risk of seeming politically ingenuous, one might conclude that there was a hasty over-reaction on the part of the United States Administration as a result of distorted and unconfirmed intelligence reports. But such a conclusion entails great danger when we recall that those who are resorting to the use of force in an irrational fashion and without taking the slightest care to verify their facts represent a great Power with an atomic potential capable of destroying mankind. We can only hope that the same haste will not prevail, or will not be demonstrated, in those areas where the use of nuclear weapons is decided upon.

26. But if we want to seem less ingenuous and to seek an explanation for the history and the present state of the animosity of the United States Administration towards the Libyan Government and people, we should recall that the refurbishing and strengthening of the American "Old Right" is reaching its heyday these days under the policy of the present United States Administration. Santa Fe, the Heritage Foundation and the like look on with pleasure as they see the implementation of their foreign policy schemes. Terrible doctrines are being turned into reality: military supremacy, respect for imperial power, decisions to try out one's strength in areas where it seems appropriate, and obsession with military confrontation with the peoples of the third world who are struggling to achieve or to preserve their political independence.

27. This motley array of concepts and policies being applied by the United States in its foreign policy is what in recent days has made military manoeuvres throughout the world the focus and the keystone of that policy. It is not that we are only now discovering gunboat diplomacy: what is occurring is that today's gunboats are aircraft carriers and are often carrying nuclear weapons.

28. This is why we are witnessing fantastic war games being conducted against other non-aligned peoples; against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea the "Team Spirit '83" manoeuvres have taken on scandalous proportions and are being conducted in a region which is militarily and politically highly sensitive.

29. On a more modest scale, but also appropriate for intimidation according to United States military calcula-

tions, are manoeuvres such as "Halcon Vista" or "Pino Grande", which are also being conducted in other politically and militarily sensitive areas such as the territory of Honduras neighbouring the Nicaraguan frontier where the counter-revolutionary bands financed by the United States are operating.

30. But the peoples of the third world are on the alert and are mobilizing firmly and resolutely to defend their independence and territorial integrity. Mobilization of the organized and aware masses has occurred in the same manner in Libya, Korea and Nicaragua, in Africa, Asia and Latin America, the areas where imperialism carries on its acts of depredation.

31. Our peoples are also expecting the United Nations and the Security Council to play their role.

32. The lofty and fundamental mission of this body to preserve peace places on our shoulders the heavy responsibility of responding diligently to these expectations of our peoples.

33. Mr. BORG (Malta): Yet again, after just a few days have passed, this body is seized of another issue which has a direct influence on the peace and security of the region I come from, the Mediterranean.

34. Malta's commitment to peace and security in the Mediterranean forms a fundamental element of its foreign policy. It is this commitment which has prompted my Government on frequent occasions to bring forcefully to the attention of the world at large the tensions and conflicts which harass our region.

35. It is this commitment which has inspired Malta's many, and continuing, initiatives on the bilateral, regional and international levels, in the United Nations, in the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and at the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, to promote and enhance the prospects for peace and co-operation among Mediterranean countries. Our latest initiative in this respect has been our proposal at the Madrid meeting of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe for the convening in Malta later this year of a meeting of experts to discuss questions relating to security in the Mediterranean as embodied in the Helsinki Final Act. We expect that all participating countries will support this initiative.

36. Malta's commitment to peace and security in the Mediterranean has led my country to adopt a status of neutrality, based strictly on the principle of non-alignment, as the centre-piece of its continuing role in this process.

37. We have made it abundantly clear that we consider our membership of the Council as providing a unique opportunity for us to continue to fulfil this role.

38. We are assured that our policies enjoy the respect and support of all peace-loving States, both in our region and beyond it. The two super-Power themselves and many of their allies have openly recognized our role for peace in the Mediterranean—in the case of the Soviet Union through a formal agreement with us, signed in October 1981, and in the case of the United States in the words of President Reagan in September 1981, reiterated by Secretary of State Shultz to our Foreign Minister during their meeting last week. This recognition strengthens us in our conviction that, together with other countries in our region, we have a major responsibility to meet the challenges posed by the tensions and conflicts which arise in our midst and to play a positive role in seeking means for their peaceful resolution.

39. The complaint brought to the Council by Libya constitutes such a challenge. The facts of which we have been apprised raise very serious preoccupations for my Government. These go beyond the obvious concern that any Government feels in the face of a dispute between two friendly countries, one of them a neighbour with which it harbours close ties of co-operation. Malta is particularly worried by the active deployment, in close proximity to its territory, of warships and other military equipment whose potential for destruction, even in the case of accident, is incalculable. We are even more worried and concerned by the implications for regional security in general, and Mediterranean security in particular, which arise out of the incidents which have just been reported to us.

40. These implications go to the heart of the whole question of regional security. We are led to ask: who in the first place has the prime responsibility for defining the security issues in any given region? Upon whom falls the major obligation to safeguard this security? And who has the ultimate responsibility of determining which course of action is most likely to reduce tension and remove the threat of the use of force which may arise at any given moment?

41. For Malta, and we believe for the majority of the members of the international community, the answers to these questions are clear: it is the regional States themselves which bear the main responsibility for safeguarding the peace and security of their region. We say this not out of any sense of antagonism to any party in a specific dispute; our record of action, as well as our expressed policies, makes it clear that we would react in the same manner whichever super-Power were involved. Rather, we say it in the firm belief that it is the regional States themselves which are principally interested in solving a problem which arises in their midst without superimposing upon it extraneous elements which might exacerbate rather than abate the local tensions that exist.

42. No country, least of all a non-aligned country, can tolerate a state of active confrontation between a super-Power and a neighbouring country. In a regional context, especially in a region as troubled as the Mediterranean, such a confrontation not only is dangerous in itself, but also poses the daunting threat of a direct confrontation between the super-Powers themselves.

43. In the Mediterranean we have a dramatic manifestation of the complications which arise when States from outside the region assume a primary, if not an exclusive, role in defining and safeguarding the security issues of a region. Our sea has become an arena of confrontation between two massively armed navies which have imported into our region the dangerous polarization which exists at the global level. Any action by one party, however localized or specific the intent in which it may be conceived, cannot but add to this dangerous polarization.

44. As a neutral country in the heart of the Mediterranean, we feel a special responsibility in seeking to engender a process of relaxation of tensions, which would lessen and eventually halt the need for the massive military deployment in our region, a region which might soon be in the unenviable position of having medium-range nuclear missiles sited in it. We strongly believe that the brandishing of military hardware, however limited in scope and objective, does not help in this process.

45. When local problems arise—and Mediterranean countries are the last to ignore the frightening and painful reality of the existence of local conflicts—the tools which must be utilized to solve these problems must be scrupulously tailored to suit the local situation. In this context, we have urged and continue to urge collective responsibility by the regional States themselves. We have based our own status of neutrality on this concept of collective responsibility by seeking acceptance of it and support for it from all our neighbours. We have every asssurance that such a collective effort is the best guarantee that our region can have of evolving into the zone of peace we all strive for.

46. From the outside Powers, especially the super-Powers, we seek genuine co-operation to enable us to evolve this collective effort. The choices to be made in any given instance might not always be self-evident. However, what must invariably be evident is the readiness to utilize the process of peaceful persuasion, in preference to the process of the threat of armed force, and the readiness to permit the regional States themselves to define and mould these peaceful processes.

47. Tragically, this has not yet been done for the Mediterranean, as the case before us amply demonstrates. We must also recall that this has not been the first incident of its kind and that we have no guarantee whatsoever that it will be the last. Herein lie the deepest roots of Malta's preoccupation.

48. As a small country, one without any military back-up forces, the only weapon we possess to convince other countries to desist from destructive confrontation is our determination and our political will. Our task is not easy. It is time that we acted, and acted quickly and decisively, in order to eradicate the ills which are besetting our countries and our peoples.

49. At this point, it is relevant to quote from a statement made last month by the Head of State of the Republic of Malta to the Yugoslav press agency *Tanjung*. In assessing the situation in the Mediterranean region, she stated that

> "One of the pillars of the Maltese socialist Government's foreign policy is to turn the Mediterranean into a zone of peace and co-operation.
>
> "With this in mind, we have used every possible international and regional forum to promote this idea, and we are pleased to say that other non-aligned countries in this region share this view and have helped us promote it.
>
> "Regrettably, the influence of the super-Powers in this very important region is still manifest, and unless their military forces withdraw from the Mediterranean we shall have to work hard and long to turn our sea into a peaceful, denuclearized region."

50. This is the very message which my delegation would like to echo today. Malta is committed to stability, peace and security in the world as a whole, and in particular in the Mediterranean region.

51. Mr. LING Qing (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): At the outset, I should like, in the name of the Chinese delegation and on my own behalf, to extend a warm welcome to Mr. Abdullah Salah, the new representative of Jordan, on his joining us in the Council and to wish him success in the discharge of his important responsibilities. We look forward to friendly co-operation with him.

52. The tension near the Gulf of Sidra in the Mediterranean has been a matter of public concern in the past few days.

53. The situation around this region has been continuously turbulent for some time now. The recent show of force and resort to military intimidation by a super-Power have brought about a further deterioration there.

54. All the countries of that region belong to the third world. We have always maintained that there are no fundamental conflicts of interest between third-world countries and that they should and can find fair and reasonable solutions to their differences through peaceful consultations. No foreign infringement of the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of these countries, including the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, should be allowed, nor is any outside interference in their internal affairs permissible. It is our hope that the Organization of African Unity [*OAU*] and the League of Arab States can play an active role in the mediation of their differences.

55. Any meddling or fishing in troubled waters by super-Powers would only aggravate the tension and jeopardize the peace and security of the region or even of the whole world. This is something we must guard against.

56. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): The next speaker is the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

57. Mr. RAJAIE-KHORASSANI (Islamic Republic of Iran): Thank you, Mr. President, for having convened this important series of meetings, which is being held in order to discuss the American aggression against the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya. You have just adjourned another series of meetings about American-inspired crimes against the Palestinians and, before having reached a draft resolution on those crimes, you are now opening another series of meetings, again to discuss yet another incident of American aggression. How many meetings did the Council have last year, and how many will be needed this year, to discuss major American attempts against the peace and security of some regions of the world?

58. There is American intervention in Latin America, there are American military units on the coasts of Africa and American Zionists in the Middle East, there is an American military presence in the Far East, there are American forces in the Indian Ocean and American devouring forces against the oppressed all over the entire world; yet, ironically enough, there is United States permanent membership in the Security Council. In this context, it is most appropriate, therefore, to say: "I take refuge in God from Satan, the accursed".

59. The United States, of course, claims that the presence of its fingers in the pies in every troubled part of the world is due to its particular interest both in international peace and security and in the security of some "friendly" régimes. The historic criminal war of America in Viet Nam, of course, gives evidence of the United States role in international peace and security. As for the American concern for "friendly" régimes, the Muslims of Iran know the exact meaning of American support for its "friendly" clients, because we still remember the effects of the 40,000 American military advisers, as well as the close co-operation of the Central Intelligence Agency of the United States (CIA) with the dirty régime of the Shah, who happened to enjoy quite a lot of American support as an American friend up to the last moment of his life.

60. Why is it that all régimes "friendly" to the United States are usually hated by their own people? Why is it that without United States support the "friends" of America cannot remain in power? Why is it that whenever a régime really friendly to American imperialism is toppled, the people of that country feel a great relief? Why is it that the third-world countries identify their liberation from a pro-American régime with the exact meaning of freedom and independence?

61. Just for the sake of argument—only, Mr. Treiki, for the sake of argument—let us suppose that the American allegations against Libya are correct. Let us suppose that Libya is really threatening some of its neighbouring régimes. Do you not think that the peoples under those "friendly" régimes can defend their Governments and régimes if they want to? There is no need for United States AWACS and naval forces to substitute themselves by force for the patriotic people of those countries. Why do the American forces not give the peoples of those neighbouring countries a chance to enjoy defending their country and their probably democratically elected Governments which just happen to be American friends? How long can those "friendly" kings and presidents be kept on the throne by American AWACS, fleets and air forces against the will of their own peoples?

62. Even the people of the United States cannot accept such fallacious allegations as those produced by the United States against Libya. The entire population of Libya, which has allegedly threatened American interests, is slightly over 3 million and definitely below 3.5 million; the number of unemployed in the United States is four times greater than the entire population of Libya. Yet, amazingly enough, the threat comes from Libya, does it not? The number of alcoholics and other addicts in the United States is definitely over four times the total population of Libya, and yet the threat comes from Libya. My delegation does not really have the exact statistics on the number of criminals who are free and walking in the streets of the United States—thanks, probably, to the Justice Department—but the number is definitely high enough to turn the country into a garrison State. Yet Libya, with a population of less than 3.5 million, is considered such a serious threat that it requires the deployment of AWACS and an aircraft carrier to the area.

63. American media claim—and the United States Administration has not yet denied—that a dozen Libyans have been captured in the Sudan and that, therefore, the crisis is over; hence the AWACS have been ordered to withdraw from Egypt all the way back to the United States, and the aircraft carrier has been ordered back towards where it had been before—near the Suez Canal. In other words, a dozen Libyans, according to the American estimation, can overthrow the régime in the Sudan. Such a representation of President Nimeiri's régime by the United States—definitely a friendly country—does not sound too complimentary. I am sure that if the President of the United States were in President Nimeiri's shoes, he would be embarrassed to see how poorly the President of the United States thinks of a friendly country. Quite unfriendly of him, is it not?

64. This is not the first time that American military forces and propaganda machines have threatened regional peace and security in various parts of the world under the guise of supporting some "friendly" régimes against others. It is the policy of imperialist forces to create differences, to sow agitation, to intervene in the affairs of other countries and to keep the oppressed nations under subjugation. It is the same forces which imposed the Zionist base upon Palestine; it is the same policy which has divided the Muslim world in order to rule it; and it is the same policy which is supporting the South African régime against the oppressed people of

Africa. Not to forget our own case, it is the same policy which imposed the war of aggression against us.

65. The position of the Muslim people and the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran *vis-à-vis* this situation is quite clear. We support the oppressed and their struggles for independence from imperialist blocs. We believe that it is the masses that make the final decision, and it is their decision which is effective.

66. Thus, in spite of the military superiority of the super-Powers—and, in this case that of the United States—the victory is actually that of the masses, the people of Libya, and imperialist plots are bound to fail. We condemn American military presence and intervention in the Middle East in general, and the recent American threat to the people and Government of the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya in particular. We strongly condemn all United States acts of aggression and the American campaign against the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya. Such American attempts are always made with the excuse that America has interests in such-and-such parts of the world. American authorities must fully realize that people in the different parts of the world are definitely more entitled to their own interests than is the United States. And so long as the United States cannot give up its illegal interests in various parts of the world, it will be impossible to maintain international peace and security. The people and Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran are happy to see that the people and Government of the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya have remained firm in defending their country bravely and decisively. We hope that their model will be followed by some others in the area who have unfortunately made their homeland a base for American military and political forces.

67. It is deplorable that any country wishing to maintain its independence has to face some form of American aggression. It is deplorable that no revolutionary people or Government can be immune from American conspiracies.

68. My delegation sincerely hopes that the Council can demonstrate its independence and its commitment to the Charter of the United Nations so as to exert pressure upon one of its own permanent members in order to prevent that member from following such destructive policies in different parts of the world—indeed, in the third world particularly—which are detrimental to the cause of peace.

69. The PRESIDENT: (*interpretation from Russian*): The next speaker is the representative of Democratic Yemen, whom I invite to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

70. Mr. AL-ASHTAL (Democratic Yemen) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The Council is meeting today in the wake of the grave developments resulting from the movements of contingents of United States air and naval military forces on the borders of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya. Four AWACS were sent to Cairo to be dispatched from there for a spying mission against Libya, while the aircraft-carrier *Nimitz* steamed towards Libyan territorial waters.

71. At first the American authorities declared that the surveillance aircraft had been dispatched to Cairo to engage in joint military manoeuvres with the Egyptian air force. Then they stated that the *Nimitz* had steamed to Libyan shores and that that military movement was aimed at deterring the Libyan forces, which were said to be preparing to interfere in the internal affairs of the Sudan. Now the United States authorities have declared that their mission has been concluded and that the AWACS, as well as their naval force, have all returned to their bases.

72. That is the brief scenario produced and directed by the United States Administration. Actually, it is part and parcel of a series of scenarios to which we have become accustomed, the most recent of which was that of the so-called Libyan assassination squads, which Washington stated had come to assassinate President Reagan. The American media went to work on those Libyan "assassination squads", which were a figment of the imagination. According to both previous and subsequent reports, American intelligence has not stopped the intimidation and distortion campaigns to which Libya has been subjected: American newspapers publish information to the effect that American intelligence had hatched a plot to get rid of the Libyan President and negate the Libyan revolution. In addition, the United States launched a widespread campaign in African and Arab capitals to bring pressure to bear on Libya and to undermine the African summit conference scheduled to be held in Tripoli.

73. Those foolhardy provocations against the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya were but one manifestation of the aggressive policy pursued by the United States Administration.

74. After forming the rapid deployment forces, the United States stated that it had organized a special military command for the Middle East. That took place simultaneously with the military manoeuvres conducted by United States forces in collaboration with its puppets in the area. One of those manoeuvres took place near the shores of Democratic Yemen.

75. In other parts of the world, United States forces continue their military manoeuvres aimed at intimidating peoples and propping up puppet régimes. In Central America, United States military manoeuvres aim at reinforcing pressure against the Sandinist revolution; in the Far East, American forces continue their grand manoeuvres with the forces of South Korea, thus jeopardizing peace and security in that area.

76. There has been differing speculation about the real significance of these American provocative acts. There are those who believe that the United States Administration's aim is to convince American public opinion of the necessity for increasing military expenditures at a time

when that policy is facing general indignation, owing to its adverse effect on social-welfare allocations, which are diminishing, thereby harming the poor and those with a limited income. There are those who say that these military scenarios constitute a continuation of the United States Administration's policy aimed at winning votes in the forthcoming elections. But those fairly familiar with United States policy confirm that the campaign being waged by the United States against Libya, on the eve of the Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, is but an American attempt to affect the proceedings of that conference and to deflect it from confronting United States aggressive policy. There are those supporters of the United States who are preparing today to undermine the policy of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, which is opposed to imperialism and neo-colonialism.

77. Whatever the reason, we have witnessed with grave concern one of the permanent members of the Security Council tampering with its obligations under the Charter of the United Nations. In addition to immobilizing the proceedings of the Council, as well as the implementation of its powers, the United States is jeopardizing international peace and security by its threats to use force. What has taken place in Libyan airspace is one such threat. The United States tried that policy during the cold-war period when it involved itself in a military intervention in South-East Asia, but then it withdrew in defeat. Does the United States want to repeat the same tragedy in the Middle East?

78. Democratic Yemen declares its full solidarity with the Libyan revolution. It stands steadfastly against United States provocations. President Ali Nasser Mohammed sent the following cable to his brother Colonel Muammar Qaddafi:

> "We in the People's Democratic Yemen are following with grave concern the provocations faced by the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya stemming from the military forces of American imperialism in the Mediterranean, in co-ordination with zionism and its allied forces. These provocative acts are but an attempt to prevent the fraternal Libyan people from exercising its effective role on the side of all progressive Arab forces and régimes in confronting the imperialist and Zionist designs that are aimed at dealing blows against the progressive Arab forces and régimes and imposing imperialist, military, political and economic hegemony on the Arab States and peoples. At the same time, we in Democratic Yemen commend your glorious steadfastness against these provocative acts and confirm our confidence in the continued steadfastness of the Libyan people and its ability to defeat all the imperialist and Zionist conspiracies."

79. The PRESIDENT: (*interpretation from Russian*): The next speaker is the representative of the Sudan. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

80. Mr. ABDALLA (Sudan) (*interpretation from Arabic*): It gives me pleasure to address the Council in Arabic. As I do so, I am truly happy to extend thanks to the Council for adopting its historic decision to introduce Arabic as an official and working language in its deliberations and work [*resolution 528 (1982)*]. I extend warm congratulations to you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency. We are completely confident that your political wisdom and diplomatic experience and know-how will enable the Council to fulfil all its duties and functions.

81. I wish also to extend thanks to your predecessor, brother Amega, the representative of Togo, for his worthy efforts last month.

82. May I also extend sincere congratulations to the new members of the Council, fully confident that their membership in the Council will enrich its work and help it to assume its role in the interests of international peace and security. My thanks go also to the outgoing members of the Council, who spared no effort in promoting the objectives which form the basis of the United Nations.

83. The Council has been convened today on Libya's request. I need not explain or stress the common cultural links between the Sudanese and Libyan peoples; these links have been strengthened throughout history by neighbourliness. Each of these links could have supported fruitful and sound relations between Libya and the Sudan but for the refusal of the Libyan leadership to allow the Sudan to exercise full sovereignty over its territory and to adopt the economic and political approaches and the foreign and domestic policies stemming from the aspirations and hopes of its people. To that one could add Libya's disregard of the principles governing normal conduct among nations, including the principle of non-intervention in their internal affairs and the principle of the non-use or threat or force in international relations. Here lies the bone of contention and the source of tension in the relations between the two countries.

84. The Council has already been informed of Libya's numerous hostile practices and of its provocations against our people and land, provocations which extended to invasion and the use of mercenaries in July 1976 to carry out its designs. The defeat of that invasion in 1976 was not the end. Libya proceeded to a series of violations of the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Sudan. In 1981 there were several Libyan violations of Sudanese airspace as well as the bombardment of villages along the borders of the Sudan and Chad. Libya intensified its aggressive actions against the social and economic infrastructure and continued an anti-Sudan campaign in all its mass media.

85. Last week's events, which have been extensively covered by all news agencies and by the world mass media, are a continuation of Libya's violations of all international rules and instruments governing the relations of States with one another and good-neighbourly relations in particular. Last week we witnessed the escala-

tion of the armed Libyan presence on our north-western frontier by the use of MiG-23s and long-range bombers. The competent Sudanese authorities obtained information from some agents arrested in Khartoum which confirmed the existence of a Libyan scheme to overthrow the legitimate Government of the country, to undermine its constitutional institutions and to impose Libyan trusteeship on the Sudanese people.

86. Faced by these grave events, which jeopardize the security, unity and stability of the Sudan and not only are aimed at destabilizing the area but also have grave implications for international peace and security, the Sudan took preventive measures to thwart that scheme and to preserve its own independence and territorial integrity.

87. In the face of such an extremely dangerous situation, the Sudan could not but use all ways and means to defend itself and its people's safety, its sovereignty, its territorial integrity and its airspace, in co-operation with all friendly and fraternal countries, in the context of international law and the Charter of the United Nations, as well as the charters of the regional organizations to which my country has the honour to belong, and also within the context of bilateral measures, foremost among which is the Egyptian-Sudanese Defence Treaty.

88. On the instructions of my Government, I should like to inform the Council of the following: first, the measures taken by the United States Administration were necessary to thwart the massive Libyan concentrations against the Sudan; secondly, following the response of the United States, it has been proved beyond doubt that there were increasing Libyan concentrations along the north-western frontier of the Sudan; thirdly, many violations by Libyan aircraft and bombers of Sudanese airspace were monitored, and our forces took preventive measures and compelled the Libyan aircraft to withdraw; and, fourthly, these joint efforts were highly effective in thwarting the Libyan scheme.

89. I need not reaffirm Sudan's whole-hearted faith in the principles and objectives which form the basis of the United Nations and in the principles of the regional organization to which both Libya and the Sudan belong. The good-neighbour policy has always been one of the corner-stones of the Sudan's foreign policy, as witnessed by the bilateral and multilateral instruments of co-operation binding the Sudan and its neighbours, which, without a doubt, constitute important tributaries of international co-operation and of the strengthening of international peace and security. On that basis, we call upon Libya to comply with these principles and to refrain from its policy of intervening in the internal affairs of other nations, particularly neighbouring countries.

90. We were recently informed by the mass media that suicide squads were formed in Libya to assassinate some presidents whose pictures were burned in public squares in Tripoli. Among them was my own President. This sheds further light on Libya's persistent resort to the threat and use of force in international relations and makes it incumbent upon the Council to follow the situation closely and to take all necessary measures to put an end to such practices.

91. Before I conclude I should like to say that the Sudan would not have brought its differences with Libya to the Council today had it not been for our concern to place things in their proper perspective and to settle such differences, which should have been done within the framework of the regional organizations to which the two countries belong. However, I had to do this because the matter had been given a partial treatment which did not reflect the full reality in the region.

92. In concluding, I should like to appeal to the Council to follow developments in our area caused by Libya's policy of intervening in the internal affairs of its neighbouring countries, a policy which has adverse international and regional effects on and negative consequences for the programmes for development and progress required by the countries of the region. I also call upon the Council to make the necessary arrangements to restore peace, stability and security there.

93. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): The next speaker is the representative of Egypt. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

94. Mr. KHALIL (Egypt) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The delegation of Egypt, in making its contribution to the debate today through this short statement, is proceeding from its concern that the facts be clarified and matters put in their true perspective. Indeed, after the detailed, clear and moderate statement of the representative of the Sudan, it is unnecessary for my country's delegation to deal with details of which the Sudanese delegation is well aware.

95. At the outset I wish to state that we shall not be lured into verbal clashes that are of no use. We have heard comments here and there and we see that it is wise, reasonable and logical to ignore such comments altogether.

96. The statements issued in Cairo concerning the latest developments were committed to refraining completely from opening the door to the possibility of using these developments to escalate the situation or raise tension needlessly. Cairo adopted this stance deliberately, out of its concern not to escalate matters, especially since the profiteers had failed to achieve their designs.

97. At the same time, it behoves us to make it clear before the Council that Egypt is fully committed to defending fraternal Sudan, in response to its request and to the extent that would be agreed upon. There is no ambiguity concerning this matter. The mutual defence treaty between our two countries is not a dead letter. It commits the two fraternal countries to the full implementation of all its provisions. The security of the Sudan is part and parcel of Egypt's national security and *vice*

versa. The two countries are fully entitled to exercise the right of sovereignty over the national territories inside their borders and also to take the measures they see fit for self-defence against any aggression or threat of aggression.

98. That is what my delegation wishes to put on record. We need not go into detail and cite examples of attempts at interference in the internal affairs of neighbouring countries. All we wish from the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya is that it commit itself in fact to what is stated by its representative in document S/15614—that is, to work for the consolidation of peace and security in the area and the peaceful settlement of disputes.

99. As everybody knows, Egypt has not raised any weapon against any Arab country. It has not shot one bullet against any Arab citizen. Throughout its long history, Egypt has been a shield and a pillar of support for the Arab nation, in both its western and its eastern flanks.

100. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received a letter dated 22 February from the representative of Jordan [*S/15619*], which reads as follows:

> "I have the honour to request the Security Council to invite Mr. Clovis Maksoud, Permanent Observer of the League of Arab States to the United Nations, to participate in the consideration of the item entitled 'Letter dated 19 February 1983 from the Permanent Representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council [*S/15615*]', under rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure."

If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Council decides to grant this request.

It was so decided.

101. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): I invite Mr. Maksoud to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

102. Mr. MAKSOUD (*interpretation from Arabic*): Mr. President, on behalf of the League of Arab States and its delegation, I wish to express our thanks to the Council for having granted our request to speak at this meeting. On this occasion I wish also to express the warm appreciation of the Arab nation for your personal role, as well as that of the Soviet Union, in supporting Arab issues of paramount importance to the fate of the Arab nation.

103. The convening of the Council with regard to this development on the eve of a non-aligned summit conference sheds clear light on the tremendous importance of the reaffirmation of the States of the third world to commit themselves to the policy of non-alignment and widen the constituency for peace in the world in order that the Arab, African, Asian and other States of the South may not all be a stage for confrontations in attempts to dictate their destiny. We wish to find the necessary guarantees for the independence of these States and the possibility for their societies to determine their own destiny without the pitfalls of military alliances that may undermine genuine independence and weaken the ability to launch initiatives and take decisions.

104. What cuts us to the quick is to see the effects of outstanding disputes which would have been better dealt with on the legal bases on which regional organizations are founded. The League of Arab States and the OAU are examples of such organizations. Actually, this makes us feel the necessity for strengthening these regional organizations, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations. All these disputes are historically transient and not perennial in our beings or in our consciences.

105. The convening of the Council to consider the military show-down in the Mediterranean leads us to the realization of what goes beyond in importance and what is deeper in effect in our contemporary history. We find that the destinies of many of the countries of the third world have been blown about by the wind. Instead, our efforts and ideas should have been focused on the priorities of genuine peace and development and progress, especially as we in the Arab nation and the third world have a vested interest in achieving international peace and détente. This peace does not constitute only a moral commitment on our part. It also constitutes for us the proper climate for the development of our societies from backwardness to advancement. In all the communities of the third world, we are suffering from economic and technological crises and from attempts by hegemonistic forces to dominate our political destinies and economic opportunities. If we do not have a definite opinion about some of the things mentioned in the course of these meetings, we, as a regional organization which seeks to crystallize and to state the Arab views of the matter, hope the United Nations will work to support the ability of the regional organizations to fulfil their tasks and to participate in the task of maintaining international peace and security.

106. The plight that we are witnessing today must be an incentive for all the third-world communities, whatever their differences may be, whether ideological or intellectual or political, to settle those differences. They have to realize that their destinies are interrelated to a large extent and that the bitter experience that we are undergoing today should lead us to rise above it in order that we may be able to discover that the factors which bring us together in the communities of the third world, as well as the challenges that unify us, are much bigger and much more effective than the factors of dissension and conflict. Such factors reduce the number of our opportunities for real independence, block our way towards unity and impair our steadfastness in progress and development.

107. Therefore, we stand today before this reality. We had hoped that this reality would have become a precedent that would prevent the pattern of intervention in the

destiny of the third world, that this would be an incentive for us in the future.

108. Thus, we hope that the arguments we have heard today, whether or not they are based on right, will enable us to rise above the climate of dissension and to benefit from them. We hope that this experience will act as an incentive for us all in the Arab and third-world nations to make the policy of non-alignment a reality in our conduct and a reality in our relations together, before we are subject once more to being used as pawns in the cold war and the arms race.

109. We therefore hope that, at a moment of awareness during this stage of the development of the Arab nation, this afternoon's events will serve as a prelude, giving us a sense of direction to confirm our independence of decision and our resolute will to contribute towards genuine and effective peace and to liberate the third world from the dangers of acute polarization and international tension, as well as from the attempts of fleets directly or indirectly to dictate their will on our ability to move forward.

110. Thus, the challenge we face today should be an impetus enabling us to affirm the common denominators we possess so that the differences that may arise between us, the nations of the third world, may be transient and not permanent divisions which can be exploited for more polarization and tension.

111. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): The representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya wishes to speak in exercise of his right of reply. I now call on him.

112. Mr. TREIKI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (*interpretation from Arabic*): We heard this morning the statement of the distinguished representative of the United States [*2415th meeting*]. I say the "distinguished representative", and I wish she were here so that she could hear these polite terms and so that she would refrain from the terms she has become accustomed to using even in such an august body as this.

113. I believe members of the Council had all expected to hear something—something important—although personally I was certain that she would repeat the words of the American mass media and the accusations made by the Zionist-controlled American media against Libya and against the leadership of its revolution. We had expected to hear proof or to be provided with evidence concerning the so-called Libyan threat. But we heard the representative of the United States quoting Radio Sudan. Do the super-Powers not have other sources of information? We thought only we small countries were in that position.

114. If we analyse the American position from the beginning—that is, before the press conference held by the President—we see that, in a broadcast, ABC referred to the United States intervention and stated that the Administration had asked it to postpone the broadcast for 24 hours. Then we witnessed the press conference held by President Reagan in which he asserted that there was no movement by the fleet and that the AWACS were conducting joint training manoeuvres with Egypt.

115. We had hoped to hear from the representative of Egypt, after the confirmation by his Government that there were no joint manoeuvres, whether or not this is true. I shall return to this point later.

116. The United States Departments of State and Defense immediately stated that there were indeed movements by the fleet and the AWACS were there because of the so-called Libyan threat: the threat posed by 3 million Libyans against 50 million Egyptians and 20 million Sudanese. The Egyptian army alone amounts to more than one third of the population of Libya. As the representative of Iran said: even if there were a threat—and that is not true, for such a threat does not exist—where does the United States come in? Has it arrogated to itself the role of the Security Council or the League of Arab States or the OAU? It has no such role.

117. The representative of the United States stated that her country is concerned with the maintenance of good relations among neighbours and that it intervened because Libya had intervened in the affairs of its neighbours. We wish that this permanent member of the Council, the United States, would employ such rational and reasonable words against Israel, which did not merely intervene but occupied: it occupied the territory of Lebanon, a neighbouring country. It has occupied a portion of Syria and annexed Syrian territory. It has occupied and annexed Jerusalem. But no, there were no such words, because Israel is the strategic ally of the United States. The Israeli aggression could not have taken place had it not been for United States intervention.

118. Is the United States concerned about the Egyptian people? Members of the Council will recall the massacre of schoolchildren in Bahar al-Baqar, in Egypt. Was that school not destroyed with United States weapons? Was not the Egyptian army destroyed again and again with United States weapons? The people of Egypt do not like the United States, and they will never be an ally of the United States—never. When the United States came to the realization that there had been a rapprochement between Egypt and the rest of the Arab nation and that Egypt was joining the Arab ranks, the United States wished to intervene and to intimidate the Egyptian Government, because it realized that the Camp David accords were finished once and for all with the Beirut massacre.

119. In the final analysis, therefore, all these manoeuvres are designed to intimidate Egypt or to hatch a plot against it from within.

120. The United States Secretary of State has said that a victory has been won: a victory by a super-Power—as though Libya were the Soviet Union or China. So the

United States has triumphed over Libya. How did it triumph? The Sudanese régime managed to arrest 12 Sudanese plotters, and thus the United States triumphed and achieved its aim. So the United States Sixth Fleet returns, along with the AWACS. This is the victory won by the United States; that, regrettably, is the logic of a super-Power which hold the fate of the world in its hands. It is incredible that a leadership with such a mentality has assumed the responsibility for the security of the world. In my view, that is the most dangerous problem facing the Security Council, which bears the responsibility for the maintenance of peace.

121. They talk about Libya's terrorism. Does Libya need certification from the United States? For my part, if the United States were to praise Qaddafi, I would be the first to oppose him, because that would mean that Qaddafi was a traitor. But it is my honour to be a soldier in my leader's army because he is against United States imperialism.

122. Who has given a certificate of good conduct to whom? In its decisions, the Sixth Conference of Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Countries, held in Havana in 1979, unanimously condemned the positions of the United States. It has not condemned Libya or Muammar Qaddafi but has condemned the United States Administration. The resolutions of Arab summit conferences held at Baghdad in 1978, Tunis in 1979 and Amman in 1980—with the participation of the Sudan and, at Tunis, with the participation of President Nimeiri personally—unanimously condemned the United States policy of aggression against the Arab nation. The Third Islamic Summit Conference, held at Mecca-Taif in 1981, condemned the imperialist policy of the United States. That policy has also been condemned by the Arab Front of Steadfastness and Confrontation, by the conferences of heads of State or Government of non-aligned countries and by the Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Non-Aligned Countries held at Belgrade in 1978.

123. Who has been condemned by the United Nations and by other international organizations? We are all Members of the United Nations, and you have witnessed this year that the United States has been isolated along with Israel from the rest of the world; concerning South Africa, sometimes other States have joined them in their isolation. Who is practising terrorism against the people of El Salvador? Against the people of Nicaragua? Who is practising intervention and terrorism against the people of Poland? Against the people of Viet Nam? Who murdered hundreds of thousands of Vietnamese? Can the United States hand out certificates of good conduct regarding terrorism while it is leading international terrorism?

124. I say to the United States that the winds of change are blowing. Somoza is gone. So is Batista. All the lackeys considered friendly by the United States will met with the same fate, and no political leader will consider himself honoured by the friendship of the United States, because that would make him the friend of imperialism, of monopolies, of colonialism.

125. Muammar Qaddafi is anti-imperialism; he is anti-monopolies and anti-zionism, and he will remain so; and this redounds to his honour. Muammar Qaddafi would cherish a certificate from the people of Nicaragua, or of Cuba, or of Viet Nam, but not from the United States Administration. We in the Arab nation, including the people of the Sudan, feel that any friend of the United States is a lackey. The United States does not accept friends; it only accepts lackeys. When the question of the AWACS was considered in Congress, Senator Jackson said that the United States had one friend in the region of the Middle East and that the rest were lackeys. The United States Administration does not accept friends or semi-lackeys; it wants full lackeys. When these lackeys are asked to accuse Libya, they accuse Libya; when they are asked to accuse the Soviet Union, they accuse the Soviet Union.

126. *The New York Times* of 16 January stated that the CIA had indicated that some States—including El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras and the Sudan—were in jeopardy. Since then, the CIA has been preparing for some action against Libya. We know of contacts with the CIA and we know that the Agency's directors have made visits to the area, but we would have liked to be furnished one piece of proof of their claims. We challenge the allegation that there has been even one single Libyan intervention in the affairs of the Sudan. If there are internal problems in the Sudan, they have nothing to do with us. There have been 19 attempted *coups* in the Sudan since the May revolution; as everyone is aware, in one of those attempted *coups*, Libya saved President Nimeiri and sprang him from gaol. The internal problems of the Sudan have nothing to do with us. We are a fraternal people of the people of the Sudan and we want to live in peace and prosperity with that people. We shall always be close. Our real enemies will remain the Americans.

127. We have had differences with the Sudan in the past, and we have severed relations and resumed relations. Now, we have differences that we will soon reconcile because we are Arabs, because we are Africans, and because our enemy is Israel and our enemy is the United States. We really have no enemy other than the United States, which provides Israel with weapons, which murders our children, which stands behind the massacres of Deir Yassin and those of Sabra and Shatila. With American napalm and American cluster bombs and American weapons, the children of Sabra and Shatila were murdered. How, then, can Americans be friends of the Arabs? That cannot be. Cairo was bombed with American planes and so was Aswan. Ismailia was destroyed with American planes. Egypt was almost destroyed by American planes, and Egypt will not be a friend of America. He who tries to be a friend of America in Egypt will meet the same fate as did Sadat, not at the hands of Libya but at the hands of the Egyptian people.

128. Libya will not intervene in the affairs of any State. The diatribes and falsehoods that we have listened to

today from the representative of the United States are an open secret. The responsibility of a super-Power, a permanent member of the Security Council, is a very grave one. The representative of the United States stated that what had happened to Libya will be repeated and that the United States is prepared to indulge in more provocation and to continue the aggression. This is evident from the statement of the United States representative. However, we say that if this is to be repeated, then let it be repeated. Let there be another Viet Nam in the Arab region. The will of the peoples is invincible. It is part of the will of God. No matter how great the United States is and no matter how strong it is militarily, our people will not kneel. The Arab peoples, including the Egyptian and Sudanese peoples, stand by the side of Libya. We are certain that if America were to commit an aggression, the Sudanese would be the first to fight at the side of the people of the Jamahiriya.

129. I apologize for having spoken at some length, but I think this issue is a very grave one and that it requires numerous details and great accuracy, as well as a sense of collective responsibility—the responsibility of the Council for the maintenance of peace, not the responsibility of America. America is not God. The age when the United States used atom bombs because others did not have them is over. The age when it destroyed the people of Japan is over. The age when it annihilated the Red Indians is over. The age when the United States monopolized Latin America is over. All of those ages are over. Although ours is a small people, it will not capitulate. Hence, we must say to American imperialism: "No, you are not responsible for maintaining peace. You are not the policeman of the United Nations." We must condemn it, and we must combine our efforts, as we did against nazism in the past, to spare humanity nazism's scourge.

130. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): The representative of the United States wishes to speak in exercise of his right of reply, and I now call upon him.

131. Mr. LICHENSTEIN (United States of America): I shall indeed be brief, as Mrs. Kirkpatrick tried earlier today to be brief, clear, precise and factual.

132. I want to assure the representative of Libya that I will convey to Mrs. Kirkpatrick his uncharacteristically kind opening statement. I shall also convey to her the unfortunately all-too-characteristic tenor of the balance of his remarks.

133. Two points only: indeed, we have many sources of information, many excellent sources of information. One of them is the radio service of the Sudan. We believe that it is a reliable and authoritative source in very great part because it is the radio service of a brave, courageous, honourable and independent people. As for our relationship with Egypt, it is the earnest hope of my Government and of the American people that we will be bound to the country and to the people of Egypt with the bonds of strong friendship. These are bonds that consist in great part of shared concerns and shared values, pre-eminent among which, in my view, is belief in non-interference in the affairs of one's neighbours and non-use of force in the resolution of international conflict, thus serving the goal of international peace and security and fulfilment of the enduring principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

The meeting rose at 6.40 p.m.

UNITED NATIONS

SECURITY COUNCIL
OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-EIGHTH YEAR

2417th MEETING: 23 FEBRUARY 1983

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2417)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
Letter dated 19 February 1983 from the Permanent Representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/15615)	1

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/...) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements* of the *Official Records of the Security Council*. The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*. The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

2417th MEETING

Held in New York on Wednesday, 23 February 1983, at 10.30 a.m.

President: Mr. Oleg Aleksandrovich TROYANOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics).

Present: The representatives of the following States: China, France, Guyana, Jordan, Malta, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Poland, Togo, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zaire, Zimbabwe.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2417)

1. Adoption of the agenda

2. Letter dated 19 February 1983 from the Permanent Representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/15615)

The meeting was called to order at 11.30 a.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Letter dated 19 February 1983 from the Permanent Representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/15615)

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): In accordance with the decision taken by the Council at its 2415th meeting, I invite the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya to take a place at the Council table; I invite the representatives of Benin, Democratic Yemen, Egypt, Ghana, the Islamic Republic of Iran, the Sudan and the Syrian Arab Republic to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Treiki (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) took a place at the Council table; Mr. Soglo (Benin), Mr. Al-Ashtal (Democratic Yemen), Mr. Khalil (Egypt), Mr. Gbeho (Ghana), Mr. Rajaie-Khorassani (Islamic Republic of Iran), Mr. Abdalla (Sudan) and Mr. El-Fattal (Syrian Arab Republic) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

2. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): I would like to inform members of the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Madagascar and Viet Nam in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the agenda. In accordance with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion, without the right to vote, in conformity with Article 31 of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Suja (Czechoslovakia), Mr. Ott (German Democratic Republic), Mr. Rácz (Hungary), Mr. Rabetafika (Madagascar) and Mr. Le Kim Chung (Viet Nam) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

3. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): The first speaker is the representative of Benin. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

4. Mr. SOGLO (Benin) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, I should like first of all to tell you how grateful I am for the great honour you have confered on me by allowing me to address the representatives of the States members of the Council on behalf of the People's Republic of Benin.

5. I am also pleased that this debate, on the deterioration of the situation off the Libyan coast, in the Gulf of Sidra, is taking place under your competent leadership. Indeed, you are the distinguished representative of a great country, the Soviet Union, with which my country is gratified to have the closest and most cordial relations, a country which more than 64 years ago raised high the banner of the glorious October revolution and thus gave to all the proletarians, all the oppressed and all the damned of the earth the hope for a new dawn of freedom, dignity and prosperity. I am therefore convinced that, with your outstanding qualities and your firmness, our debates will bring successful results.

6. I should also like to tell your predecessor, the representative of Togo, our brother Atsu [illegible]ffi Amega, how grateful we are for the very remarkable way in which he conducted the work of the Council last month. No less could have been expected of such a seasoned diplomat, who combines a complete knowledge of the facts with an innate vitality and dynamism.

7. The people and the Government of Benin could not fail to be concerned at the situation which, since 16 February, has prevailed in the Mediterranean off the coast of

Libya. As soon as the events were reported, the Head of State of Benin, Mathieu Kerekou, addressed to his Libyan counterpart a telegram, which I shall now read out:

"The news which has just reached us concerning the military manoeuvres now in progress in the Mediterranean and in the regions adjoining the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya is a matter of great concern to us.

"There can now be no doubt that these military manoeuvres constitute a threat to the security, peace and stability of the peoples and States of the region.

"In that connection, we should like, on behalf of the Beninese people, of their leading party, the People's Revolutionary Party of Benin, of their National Executive Council, and on our own behalf, to assure you of our total support and our active solidarity in your determination to defend the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and the achievements of its revolution.

"We reiterate our unfailing dedication to the ideals of peace, equality and social justice so dear to our two peoples.

"Now and in the future, as in the past, the Beninese people will militantly support any action designed to safeguard peace, cohesion and good understanding in all corners of Africa so that the peoples of these regions may devote themselves whole-heartedly to the national tasks of construction and development."

8. By its participation in this debate, my delegation wishes only to reaffirm the immutable principles on the basis of which the United Nations was founded and to which we have all declared our commitment.

9. In fact, non-interference in the internal affairs of other States and the peaceful settlement of disputes have always constituted the key principles on which the foreign policy of my country has been based. This is why the Government of Benin has always deplored any policy based on force or the threat of force, from any source, in international relations.

10. If the Council were able to invite the various parties to the conflict to heed these principles, it would discharge the primary task incumbent upon it and protect the peoples of the region from a situation which threatens not only their efforts at construction and development but also international peace and security.

11. Ready for the revolution, the struggle continues!

12. Mr. NATORF (Poland): At the very outset, I wish to associate myself with the cordial words of welcome extended to our new colleague, Mr. Abdullah Salah, of Jordan. My delegation wishes him every success in discharging his duties.

13. The item on our agenda today is the letter dated 19 February from the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya addressed to the President of the Council requesting an urgent meeting of the Council to consider the deteriorating situation near the Libyan shores that could jeopardize the security and peace of the region and the world.

14. For a few days the world has been watching the development of the situation with grave concern and attention. AWACS aircraft were dispatched by the United States to a country neighbouring Libya. The United States aircraft-carrier *Nimitz*, accompanied by some naval vessels, was deployed close to the Libyan coast.

15. Coupled with those military moves was a press campaign maintained at a high pitch, as well as unfriendly if not openly hostile statements addressed to Libya.

16. These actions of the United States were unprovoked. There is no justification for them. The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya has on numerous occasions, both in the past and now, confirmed that it has no intention whatsoever of interfering in the internal affairs of any country and that it is anxious to see security and peace prevail in the area. Such confirmation was given once again in the statement delivered yesterday by the representative of Libya [*2415th meeting*], who also presented a long list of self-evident facts testifying to the hostile steps against Libya taken by the United States. The efforts to prove the allegations, accusations and false suggestions that the moves were connected with "plotting to overthrow" one of the neighbouring Governments are condemned to failure. They will not be found credible by world public opinion. It will not be easy to believe claims that the deployment of naval vessels and the air force in the region had been planned beforehand as a training exercise. Neither can one easily accept charges that the Libyan policy towards its neighbours posed a threat to the security of the region. Interestingly, none of its neighbours has requested a meeting of the Council.

17. The provocations against Libya stem from the policy of confrontation based on military threats, intimidation and coercion that is being pursued by the United States Administration. It is this very policy that is aimed at influencing events and at interfering in the internal affairs of others whenever they are not to the liking of that Administration. The efforts to apply this policy are well known in other regions of the world also, and in many countries, including my own.

18. My country attaches particular importance to the question of the consolidation of peace. Not so long ago, in the Political Declaration adopted at the meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of the States Parties to the Warsaw Treaty, held at Prague on 4 and 5 January, Poland, together with other socialist members of the defensive alliance, noted, *inter alia*, that:

"the improvement of the situation in the world is to a great extent connected with the elimination of existing

and prevention of new flashpoints of military conflict in Asia, Africa, Latin America and other areas" [*S/15556, annex, sect. IV*].

19. Hence, my delegation has followed the present debate with keen interest and attention. We took note, *inter alia*, of the statement made yesterday by the representative of Malta, [*2416th meeting*], in which he spoke about the responsibility of the regional Powers for building the structures of peace and security in their region, including the possibility of changing the Mediterranean into a zone of peace.

20. At this point, may I recall that it has been the States Parties to the Warsaw Treaty which have for years consistently been putting forward proposals concerning the lowering of the level of deployment of the naval forces of the opposing military blocks in the Mediterranean. In the above-mentioned Political Declaration, they called for the opening of talks on the limitation of naval activities, on the limitation and reduction of naval equipment and on the application of confidence-building measures to seas and oceans. They were in favour of withdrawing nuclear-equipped vessels from the Mediterranean and of renouncing the deployment of nuclear weapons on the territory of Mediterranean non-nuclear countries [*S/15556, annex, sect. II*].

21. If the other parties concerned had responded to these proposals constructively, we could now have been much closer to attaining the objective set forth in the statements of Malta, Libya and other countries of the region.

22. In accordance with the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, the Council is responsible for maintaining peace and security. Today, in discharging this duty, we focus our attention on the unprovoked actions which bring potential dangers. The Charter places an obligation on all Members to

> "refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations."

23. We wish to point out that these provisions should be strictly observed by all Members of the United Nations, including the United States, a permanent member of the Security Council.

24. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): The next speaker is the representative of the German Democratic Republic. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

25. Mr. OTT (German Democratic Republic): The Council must again deal with problems in the region of the Middle East and the Mediterranean. My delegation understands the request made by the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya for the convening of an urgent meeting of the Council, because it shares the concern of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and other States that a deterioration of the situation in that region could have dangerous consequences for peace and security.

26. The peoples of the non-aligned countries in Africa, as well as in Asia and Latin America, have embarked upon a road of independent development. They resolutely oppose all attempts by imperialist Powers to interfere in their internal affairs and attempts by those Powers to achieve their neo-colonialist aims through pressure and blackmail, through threats and use of force. The German Democratic Republic holds the view that the peoples and States in the Middle East also are able to solve their problems by their own sovereign decisions. To this end, they need neither an imperialist world gendarme nor a self-appointed arbitrator who wants to dictate law and order to them through gunboat politics. Many people concerned about the maintenance of peace in the world rightly wonder why the United States is once again demonstrating its policy of strength thousands of miles away from its own territory on the pretext of safeguarding its so-called vital interests. This is obviously an element of the imperialist course of confrontation and super-armament, of the crusade against social progress and national liberation in the world. It is also no secret that imperialism is pursuing the aim of extending its military presence in the Middle East and of implementing its hegemonistic endeavours in that region.

27. The "strategic alliance" between the United States and Israel and the refusal to contribute to a comprehensive, just and lasting solution to the Middle East problem serve that purpose. Also aimed at achieving this purpose is the creation of a so-called rapid deployment force which can now already be moved in full strength to the region of the Middle East and the Near East within the shortest possible time. A United States central military command for this region has the task of setting up new military bases and of conducting and co-ordinating military action. The true causes of the persistent increase in tensions in the region of the Middle East and the Mediterranean, as well as in other areas of the world, can be found in this imperialist policy.

28. This is becoming visible on the European continent, where, because of the planned deployment of new American medium-range nuclear missiles, peace and security are greatly threatened. In Latin America and the Caribbean, new provocations are persistently launched against the independence and sovereignty of the States and peoples of those regions. In southern Africa, the *apartheid* régime is encouraged to perpetrate new acts of aggression against sovereign States. In many regions of Asia, new tensions are provoked by the imperialist policy of confrontation.

29. Faithful to the principles of its socialist foreign policy and devoted to the principles and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations, the German Democratic Republic opposes military and political actions which dangerously increase tensions, and unswervingly supports a peaceful solution of all international issues. The

German Democratic Republic continues to side with the people of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and with the other Arab States in their struggle for the preservation of their independence and national sovereignty.

30. Mr. MASHINGAIDZE (Zimbabwe): I wish first of all, Sir, to add my own voice to those of the many who have already congratulated you on your assumption of the presidency for this month. Because of your well-known diplomatic qualities and wide experience, as well as your personal charm, the current deliberations of the Council are already assured of a successful outcome.

31. Through you, Mr. President, I wish to pay a richly deserved tribute also to your predecessor, the representative of Togo, Mr. Amega, for the exemplary manner in which he presided over the business of the Council during the month of January.

32. On my own behalf, and on behalf of the Zimbabwe delegation, I should also like warmly to welcome the new representative of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, Mr. Abdullah Salah. My delegation looks forward to an excellent working relationship with him, as we have always had with his predecessor.

33. The current meetings of the Council have been convened at the request of the Government of the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya to "consider the deteriorating situation near the Libyan shores that could jeopardize the security and peace of the region and the world", to quote from the letter which the Libyan representative addressed to the President of the Council on 19 February. The letter, further, attributed this deterioration of the situation to what it called the "provocative military actions of the United States Administration", which moved its nuclear-powered aircraft-carrier *Nimitz* and some other naval vessels too close to the Libyan coast. It is also reported that, in addition, the United States dispatched four air-force airborne warning and control system planes, called AWACS, to Libya's eastern neighbour, Egypt. These very sophisticated planes, we are told, have been sent there for the purpose of carrying out spying and surveillance activities over the already troubled and dangerously sensitive Libyan territory and waters.

34. The Libyan charges, however, have been rejected as "false and malicious" by the representative of the United States in a letter of 22 February addressed to the President of the Council. The United States representative, further, made counter-accusations against Libya, whose policies, she said, posed a threat to international peace and security [*see S/15617*].

35. In his statement before the Council on 22 February [*2415th meeting*], the Libyan representative catalogued numerous acts of aggression and destabilization perpetrated by the United States Government against his country.

36. Although, for her part, the United States representative maintained [*ibid.*] that the United States Government had dispatched no offensive aircraft into the disputed area and had thus violated no Libyan airspace or Libyan territorial waters, she did not challenge the list of aggressive and destabilizing acts and intentions against Libya which was cited by the Libyan representative. Instead, she drew attention to what she referred to as Libya's policy threatening the peace and security of that country's neighbours.

37. The United States representative further warned that her country would intervene wherever and whenever it felt that Libya was threatening a country which is friendly to the United States. Indeed, she affirmed her country's rights in that regard. Accordingly, it has been argued that the dispatching of hideous and sophisticated military equipment to North Africa last week was done in pursuit of this objective. That is all in spite of the assurances by both Egypt and the Sudan that neither of them had been threatened by Libya. It would appear to us, therefore, that last week's events, which naturally caused so much consternation and outrage in Libya and other parts of the world, including the United States itself, were prompted by motives other than the protection of a friendly country or countries. In our view, it would appear that last week's events were prompted by a desire on the part of the United States to settle some undisclosed scores with Libya.

38. The Council must make it clear to all concerned that no country, no matter how powerful, has any right or authority to arrogate to itself the role of policing the world; that while countries have every right to define their national interests and aspirations as they perceive them, no country has any right to pursue its rights in a manner which endangers regional or international stability, peace and security. There can be no doubt that the dispatching of hideous and sophisticated military equipment to North Africa last week by the United States dangerously threatened regional and world peace and security. The Council must particularly deplore and denounce such reckless actions and violations of the Charter of the United Nations, especially when the perpetrators are its members, indeed its permanent members, which should be aware of their special responsibility under the Charter.

39. The events of last week must have surprised and, indeed, shocked all the members of the Council, as they did us of the Zimbabwe delegation, taking place as they did at a time when the Council is carrying out serious consultations on the report of the Secretary-General on the work of the Organization in order to make the Council more effective in its role as the guarantor of international peace and security.

40. Finally, because of the by now all-too-familiar and long history of unhappy United States-Libyan relations caused in part by United States military manoeuvres in the disputed region and also because of the likely threat of those unhappy relations to international peace and security if allowed to persist—and also partly because the United States has only partially withdrawn its sophisti-

cated equipment from the area—the Council must continue to be seized of the question beyond this series of meetings until it is satisfied that the situation has changed for the better.

41. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): The next speaker is the representative of Viet Nam. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

42. Mr. LE KIM CHUNG (Viet Nam) (*interpretation from French*): I should like to begin by extending to you, Sir, on behalf of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam, our warm congratulations on your assuming the presidency for this month and to wish you every success in the discharge of your weighty responsibilities in the interest of maintaining international peace and security.

43. I should also like to convey my best wishes to all the members of the Council, and particularly to the newly elected members.

44. Lastly, I should like to thank members of the Council for having given me this opportunity to address the Council at this time.

45. Scarcely had the Council terminated the meetings that were convened to consider the danger inherent in the policy of annexation practised by Israel in the occupied Arab and Palestinian territories than it has been called upon to meet once again post-haste today to examine the serious situation that has been created by the acts of military threat and provocation perpetrated by the United States against the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya.

46. After having fabricated a so-called Libyan threat against the Sudan, the United States Government was emboldened to send large naval and air forces to the immediate vicinity of the sea and land frontiers of the Jamahiriya, to engage in activities there extremely hostile to that country. The Jamahiriya has thus had to confront a serious threat of aggression against its sovereignty and its territorial integrity, a threat likely to generate explosive situations that will militate against the peace and security of the entire Mediterranean region.

47. In his letter dated 18 February, addressed to the President of the Council [*S/15614*], the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya reaffirmed his country's policy of peace and good-neighbourliness and demonstrated that there was no valid justification for such far-reaching acts, responsibility for which must be borne solely by the United States. We can get a better idea of the serious nature of the threat that has been posed by these new acts of provocation if we recall the anachronistic position of the United States with regard to the extent of the territorial waters of coastal States. Indeed, pointedly ignoring the new United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea,[1] which has fixed the extent of territorial waters at 12 nautical miles, the United States Government persists in recognizing a limit of only 3 miles. It was in the light of that concept that the United States deliberately violated Libyan airspace in August 1981 and even went so far as to open fire on Libyan planes that were on mission within the boundaries of the national territory of the Jamahiriya. It is easy to imagine, therefore, how the risks of explosive conflicts between Libyan military forces and American military forces could escalate were the current presence of American naval and air forces to continue to be maintained so near to the international frontiers of the Jamahiriya.

48. It is appropriate to take note of the fact that the new acts of provocation by the United States against the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya represent the culminating point in a premeditated and hostile campaign of subversion, intimidation and destruction that has been waged for a long time against the people's socialist régime in Libya, as well as against other progressive non-aligned countries in the region, a campaign intended both to divide the Arab States in order to subjugate them and to impose United States imperialist domination throughout the Middle East region.

49. Of particular gravity is the fact that such brazen acts are being perpetrated by the United States itself, a permanent member of the Security Council and therefore a country bearing the main responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. This is a threat to use the force of arms against a peace-loving Arab State, a member of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and a Member of the United Nations, in absolute violation of the fundamental principles of the Charter of the United Nations and international law, as well as of the elementry rules governing the conduct of equal and sovereign States. Such arrogance is particularly intolerable in that it was blatantly displayed yesterday, in a solemn meeting of the Council, by the representative of the United States [*2415th meeting*], who reaffirmed that her country was prepared to repeat similar acts of military provocation.

50. This, however, reveals the international-policeman mentality and acts that the United States has not hesitated to employ in other circumstances in various parts of the world in order to impose its diktat and its hegemony upon peoples of countries that are resolutely struggling to safeguard their dignity, their freedom and their independence.

51. In this connection, I would invite representatives to recall the famous so-called Gulf of Tonkin incident, an incident that was entirely trumped up by the United States in 1964 as a pretext for unleashing its war of destruction against what was then North Viet Nam. May I here stated parenthetically that there is in fact a striking similarity between the present situation obtaining on the Libyan maritime borders and that which then prevailed off the coast of Viet Nam. Indeed, the Gulf of Tonkin is the virtual counterpart of the Jamahiriya's Gulf of Sidra, for in 1964 American warships defiantly penetrated parts of that Gulf that are within our domestic waters in order to indulge in acts of provocation and to create a pretext for undertaking punitive acts of aggression against our country.

52. Unfortunately, those provocative acts swiftly led to a full-scale war of aggression imposed on the Vietnamese people by four successive United States Administrations, the longest, costliest, most immoral and, indeed, the most unpopular war of aggression ever waged in United States history, and one which finally ended in lamentable failure. The Vietnamese people, which today is still the victim of daily acts of provocation, subversion and undermining that pose serious threat to its sovereignty and territorial integrity—acts committed by the expansionists and hegemonists of Asia, in close collusion with the American imperialists—profoundly sympathizes with the people of the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and fully supports it in its resolve to exercise its right of self-defence and to take every necessary step in order to defend the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of its country, as well as the inviolability of its airspace and territorial waters. On the basis of its own personal experience, the Vietnamese people is convinced that this just struggle enjoys the firm support of all peace- and justice-loving forces throughout the world, including those in the United States, and that it will certainly be crowned with victory.

53. In conclusion, I should like to read out the following statement made on 21 February by the spokesman for the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam in connection with the United States acts of provocation against the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya.

> "The people and Government of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam vehemently condemn the aforementioned acts of provocation and demand that the Government of the United States immediately put an end to all its threats and to all its acts of intervention and aggression against the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and other Arab States. The people and Government of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam reaffirm their militant solidarity with and firm support for the people of the Jamahiriya, as well as for the peoples of Palestine and other Arab countries in their struggle against American imperialism and Israeli zionism in order to secure their fundamental sacred and inviolable national rights."

54. I have been requested by my Government to ask the Council, after urgent consideration of the present serious situation that has been created by the United States on the sea and land borders of the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, to take the necessary steps commensurate with the weighty responsibility incumbent upon it under the Charter to prevent a recurrence of United States acts of provocation and aggression against the Jamahiriya and to preserve the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of that country, as well as peace and security throughout the Mediterranean region.

55. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): The next speaker is the representative of Czechoslovakia, whom I invite to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

56. Mr. SUJA (Czechoslovakia): Mr. President, may I first of all express my thanks to you and the members of the Council for giving me this opportunity to address the question under discussion. We are happy to see in the Chair an experienced and wise diplomat, the representative of a fraternal country which so actively, consistently and as a matter of high principle struggles for the strengthening of world peace and international security and for disarmament and the policy of détente, a country which so resolutely defends the rights and vital interests of the nations of the world.

57. I should like also to express our appreciation to your predecessor, Mr. Amega of Togo, for his responsible and eloquent guidance of this body during the month of January.

58. Let me also congratulate the new members of the Council and wish them success in their very responsible work.

59. Czechoslovakia is following with grave concern the tense situation that has arisen in connection with the activity of United States military forces in the immediate vicinity of the territory belonging to the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya. The convening of the Council at Libya's request to consider this problem is fully justified, since Libya is entitled to exercise its right to defend its existence pursuant to Article 2, paragraph 4, of the Charter of the United Nations.

60. The need for a thorough consideration of the problem is multiplied by the fact that this is not the first instance within a short period of time when the United States has threatened to use force against Libya for the purpose of asserting its military-political interests. The case under consideration offers another example of how far the policy of acting from a position of strength can go. As numerous speakers before me have stated, the allegation concerning a so-called Libyan threat to the territorial integrity of another State is not based on reality, as is confirmed by statements of official representatives of some countries in that region.

61. Whatever the assertions of the parties might be, there is no norm in international law that would entitle anybody to threaten to use force to achieve changes in the relations between other subjects of international law. May I be permitted to recall that the Charter provides for sufficient peaceful means of resolving possible disputes among States on the bilateral and regional, as well as world-wide, levels. It is well known that under Chapters VI and VII of the Charter, an exceptionally important role is ascribed to the Security Council. It is to be expected, particularly of a permanent member of the Council, that it assert and use in practice only those means which strengthen international peace and security and enhance the role of the United Nations.

62. Obviously, what we are dealing with here is, in substance, as act of pressure designed to weaken the international standing of Libya, a country which consistently stands up against imperialism and for the definitive elimi-

nation of colonialism, zionism and racism in all their forms and manifestations. It is an endeavour to complicate Libya's further successful progress in building up its economy and, in a broader context, to aggravate tensions in that region.

63. Similar attempts directed against the Arab States are aimed at artificially creating further conditions for a settlement of the problems of the Middle East in the spirit of the Camp David negotiations and against the interests of the Arab countries and the Palestinian Arab people.

64. However, this provocation is also another dangerous manifestation of the current militaristic policy of the United States in the entire strategic region of the Middle East, including the Gulf, as well as in the region of the Indian Ocean—in other words, in the operational area of the newly established central military command of the United States; in that area where, as is known, the infrastructures for the rapid deployment forces are being completed. In this case, too, it is again borne out that agreements for American military bases in the territories of other States thousands of kilometres away from the United States serve in practice as a spring-board for the systematic escalation of its military force in critical areas of the world, for military manoeuvres and command exercises and for demonstrations of strength to independent countries in those areas.

65. The fact that this course of action is in direct contravention of the inalienable rights of the respective States and that it ignores the basic principles of the Charter is rightly a matter of concern to the international community. Nor can there be any doubt that this threat of force in respect of Libya is obviously related to American-Israeli strategic co-operation. Therefore, the activity of the United States near Libya's borders not only represents a direct threat to Libya itself but also endangers peace and stability in the entire region, a region the problems of which can be solved only by collective and constructive efforts of all interested States, particularly by utilizing the relevant United Nations instruments.

66. As emphasized in the Political Declaration of the States Parties to the Warsaw Treaty, adopted at Prague on 5 January:

> "It is most important for all to recognize the legitimate right of the people of every country to decide its own internal affairs, without external interference, and to . . . respect the independence, territorial integrity and inviolability of the borders of States, observe the principle of the renunciation of the use of force or threat of force; and that no Power try to pursue a policy of hegemony or to establish 'spheres of interest' or 'spheres of influence'" [*S/15556, annex, sect. IV*].

67. The decision to dispatch military units to the zone adjacent to the sovereign territory of Libya cannot be regarded other than as a gross violation of the cogent norms of international law.

68. When we consider the current strategic doctrines of the United States, the borderline between a threat of force, including nuclear force, and its actual use becomes ever less distinct. In this connection and also in the context of the plans for the deployment of medium-range nuclear missiles in some Western European countries—which can be a source of tension in that region, too—the socialist countries have repeatedly stated that they are keenly interested in strengthening the security of the Mediterranean and in transforming that region into one of peace and co-operation. A realistic programme has been submitted for reducing military tension in the Mediterranean which includes the adoption of confidence-building measures in the military sphere, reduction of armed forces, non-deployment of nuclear weapons on the territory of non-nuclear Mediterranean States, and withdrawl from the Mediterranean Sea of ships carrying nuclear weapons.

69. This military threat offers further proof of the pressing need to adopt without delay effective international instruments that would eliminate any use of force, both nuclear and conventional, as well as the threat of the use of such force also in respect of third countries. That, too, as is known, was suggested at the above-mentioned Prague session of the highest organ of the Warsaw Treaty on 5 January, but so far the United States has not responded to that proposal.

70. Czechoslovakia, which in September last year concluded a treaty of friendship and co-operation with Libya, fully supports the justified demands of that country for the safeguarding of peace, sovereignty and security in keeping with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

71. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): The next speaker is the representative of Madagascar. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

72. Mr. RABETAFIKA (Madagascar) (*interpretation from French*): The excellent relations that exist between our two peoples and Governments prompt me to associate the delegation of the Democratic Republic of Madagascar with all those which have congratulated you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency. Your great experience within the United Nations and your mastery of international affairs are a guarantee of the success of the present debates of the Council.

73. We extend our fraternal and sincere thanks to the representative of Togo for the responsible and effective way in which he presided over the Council last month.

74. Lastly, I should like through you, Mr. President, to thank the members of the Council for having agreed to allow my delegation to participate in this debate.

75. In its capacity as a member of the Organization of African Unity [*OAU*], the Democratic Republic of Madagascar is always concerned when the security, independence and sovereignty of a country which belongs to that

organization are challenged. The events that led to the convening of this emergency meeting of the Council, therefore, did not leave us indifferent, above all because they concern the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, which shares with our country the same revolutionary ideals and with which we have very close relations of friendship and co-operation.

76. Every country is entitled to its own interpretation of circumstances, and we know that some not only down-play the scope of the request made by the Libyan Government but even go so far as to see in the present debate little more than a pointless verbal conflict.

77. But is it possible to say that the Libyan accusations are pointless, that there was no threat, no intimidation or provocation against that country?

78. We do not wish in this statement to repeat on our own behalf what *The New York Times*, on 22 February, revealed concerning the existence of a plan aimed at provoking Libya and then of destroying all or part of the Libyan air force; indeed, this was mentioned here by the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya [*2415th meeting, para. 25*]. That newspaper is responsible for the news it prints; it is a newspaper which we have come to consider as one of the symbols of a free and independent press, the pride and pillar of American democracy.

79. Suffice it for us to point out that there is a certain contradiction in, on the one hand, denying all the Libyan accusations and, on the other, proclaiming that the mission of the AWACS and the aircraft-carrier *Nimitz* yielded the planned-for results.

80. On the basis of the latter affirmation, it seems to us impossible to escape the conclusion that there is at least one point of agreement between the American side and the Libyan side—namely, that there was a desire on the part of one to influence the other and to dictate certain behaviour to it.

81. A certain number of considerations come to mind in light of the latter observation.

82. The first concerns the fact that the Charter of the United Nations prohibits the threat or use of force in international relations. This is an obligation incumbent upon States regardless of the nature of the problems they have to solve and whether or not they have normal diplomatic relations. It is also the duty of those that have particular responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. In any event, a demonstration of force in no way becomes legitimate just because it produced the desired effect.

83. The second consideration involves the regional aspect of the situation to be resolved. Clearly, if a question involving the security or alleged security of a region or subregion arises, the responsibility to define the nature and scope of the question belongs first and foremost to the countries belonging to that region and, if they so desire, to the Security Council.

84. It is those countries that are primarily concerned with the maintenance of harmonious relations among themselves, and the injection of a foreign influence in that equation tends to exacerbate rather than to allay localized tension. In the case now before us, the confrontation of Libya with a super-Power cannot fail to be of serious concern to the countries of the region since that confrontation opens the possibility of widening the crisis without excluding the possibility of confrontation between the two super-Powers. That inherent danger can only aggravate the feeling of insecurity of the African countries which more and more see a further division of the African continent into several zones that are under the exclusive influence of any given Power.

85. The third consideration, and the last that comes to mind, stems from that arbitrary division and from the role that foreign Powers try to play in regions that fall within their spheres of influence.

86. Unfortunately, as in the present case, it happens that, on the basis of ideological analysis, which is not always correct, certin Powers tend to impose their views and have their own interests prevail over the interests of the countries of the region in the search for solutions to local conflicts.

87. In the view of the Government of the Democratic Republic of Madagascar, the military demonstration that is at the root of the present crisis was a manoeuvre which did not contribute to the establishment of stable and harmonious relations among the countries of the region. On the contrary, it pointlessly endangered the peace and security of the region since, as indicated by the press, recurrence of the serious incidents of August 1981 was even envisaged. It has become a source of division among African countries and has exacerbated tensions to the detriment of international peace and security.

88. The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, for its part, affirms that there is no situation in the region that warrants this military provocation on the part of the United States. It has proclaimed before the Council and before other bodies its commitment to peace and security in the region and has indicated at the highest political level its intention not to intervene in the internal affairs of its neighbours.

89. We, for our part, are convinced that it is in no way the intention of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya to declare any kind of war against any of its neighbours.

90. The Government of the Democratic Republic of Madagascar has no doubt that the resources of regional agreement could help the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya's neighbours to find, together with the Jamahiriya, the arrangements that are most in keeping with their common interests. This is why the Democratic Republic of Madagascar solemnly appeals for an end to the policy of confrontation, provocation and pointless intimidation and appeals to the super-Powers in particular to refrain from that policy, whether it be in Africa, as is the case

now, or in Asia, as was the case in the manoeuvres off the coast of Korea.

91. The Democratic Republic of Madagascar invites the African countries concerned to embark, through dialogue, on a policy of détente and mutual accommodation. In our view, this is the only course of action commensurate with their prestige, the only way of removing the continent from the influence of the major Powers. In a word, it is the only course of action that can lead to the establishment of a genuine and lasting peace in the region.

92. Mr. KARRAN (Guyana): I should like, first of all, to join with previous speakers in welcoming the representative of Jordan, Mr. Abdullah Salah. My delegation looks forward to working very closely with him, as we did with his distinguished predecessor, Mr. Nuseibeh.

93. We are meeting at the request of the Government of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya to consider "the deteriorating situation near the Libyan shores that could jeopardize the security and peace of the region and the world". My delegation supports the call for this series of meetings, for it is within this forum that conflict situations ought to be examined with a view to defusing tensions.

94. The international community has been calling for the creation of zones of peace in various regions of the world, with the emphasis on the establishment of friendly relations among States. In inter-State relations, nations must pursue action that would lead to stability and peace; they must respect political independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity and must refrain from acts of provocation and aggression against other States, for such acts jeopardize peace and lead to instability and tension.

95. Guyana reaffirms the right of every sovereign State to choose its own political, economic and social systems without outside interference or threat.

96. These fundamental principles are embodied in the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations,[2] and in the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security.[3] More recently, these principles have been elaborated by the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries in the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention and Interference in the Internal Affairs of States.[4] This most recent declaration, which was adopted by the General Assembly in 1981, is the culmination of several years of work by the Non-Aligned Movement and is subscribed to by the parties concerned in this matter. It is therefore incumbent upon States to abide by these principles, which are not contrary to the principles embodied in the Charter.

97. My delegation is particularly concerned over the tendency of some States to arrogate to themselves the role of the Security Council, the body charged with the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security.

98. The tense global situation is indeed cause for concern. This most recent tension can only aggravate an already charged atmosphere. There is, therefore, greater need for restraint and calm. As the forum primarily responsible for the maintenance of international peace and security, we must follow very closely the situation brought to our attention by the Government of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya. It is my delegation's sincere belief that, with this just resort to the Council, a climate of peace and stability will soon be restored within the region.

99. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): The next speaker is the representative of Ghana. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

100. Mr. GBEHO (Ghana): At the outset, Sir, I should like to offer you my Government's congratulations and my own on your assumption of the presidency.

101. Similarly, our congratulations go to the new members of the Council on their having been called upon to play a role in bringing international peace and security to a troubled world.

102. I should also like to thank you, Sir, for giving me the opportunity to participate in the debate on this serious occasion when the Council is dealing with a threat to international peace and security in the eastern Mediterranean. Ghana, as a Member of the United Nations, shares the international community's concern about any situation which poses a potential or actual threat to international peace and security. When the situation involves fellow members of the OAU and the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries with which Ghana has friendly relations, our anxiety is substantially increased. It is also a matter of considerable embarrassment for us when the situation involves a super-Power with which we are friendly and to which we look to use its undisputed leverage and leadership to ensure international peace and harmony.

103. It is in this context that my country is intervening in the debate occasioned by the letter dated 19 February from the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya addressed to the President of the Council.

104. Our concern about recent events in the eastern Mediterranean stems from the awareness that, unless prompt and effective action is taken to deal with simmering tensions, there is always the danger of escalation into a full-scale crisis. It is therefore timely and appropriate that the Council has taken up the issue.

105. It is our fervent hope that urgent action will be taken to remove any risk of further tensions. In this regard, Ghana would like to remind the Council that all States Members of the United Nations are enjoined to conduct their affairs so as to promote international peace

and security and that threats of aggression and other similar actions are not only contrary to the Charter but actually worsen the situation.

106. Ever since the recent tension in the eastern Mediterranean started building last week, Ghana's concern has been considerably heightened by a conspicuous lack of watertight evidence in favour of the military and naval buildup that the United States precipitated in the area. On the contrary, available reports have encouraged caution rather than the rush to arms that we have all witnessed.

107. We have listened carefully to the statements by the representatives of both the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and the United States [*2415th meeting*]. We find the catalogue of unfriendly actions against the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya which its representative described to be very disturbing.

108. The statement by the representative of the United States provided an explanation which, while clearly demonstrating that the United States acted in its own self-interest, did not in itself contribute to a lessening of international tension. We have come to that regrettable conclusion after having carefully studied statements attributed to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, George P. Shultz, and State Department officials. Their statements, both official and private, have not only contradicted one another in some cases but also have failed to establish clearly, for the benefit of the international community, the so-called Libyan threat to which the United States reacted.

109. One would have thought that, in such a serious situation that warranted the rush of a super-Power to the rescue of African countries in the region, the protected would themselves be clearly convinced of the so-called threat. This waas obviously not the case, as reported in *The Washington Post* of 21 February. That newspaper reported official Government sources in Khartoum as stating that there had been no *coup* attempt and that only 25 persons had been arrested over the past three months. The same newspaper quoted the Egyptian Defence Minister, Abdelhalim Abu-Ghazala, as telling reporters that he did not see any signs of crisis or a possible aggression against the Sudan at present. A Foreign Ministry spokesman in Cairo was also reported as having said that Egypt did not see any real threat against President Nimeiri. Even more significant is the report that the Sudan confirmed that no joint manoeuvres were taking place or planned between the two armies for the time being. In such circumstances, it is difficult to comprehend the manner in which the danger was determined or the justification for what has turned out to be an over-reaction on the part of the United States.

110. But it seems that the real purpose of the rapid deployment of forces by the United States in the area was revealed in *The New York Times* of 22 February, when it stated that:

> "The plan, according to the American officials, was to lure Libya into striking and then to destroy as much of its air force as possible. If no strike occurred, the plan was to assert that prompt help to Egypt had deterred Libya. This was, in effect, what Mr. Shultz said Sunday."

111. If this indeed is the story, then it was a serious threat to the sovereignty of a State Member of the United Nations and other States in the area which the Council should deprecate and seek to prevent in the future.

112. The Charter of the United Nations contains provisions for dealing with perceived threats to international security, but none of these provisions authorizes the unilateral diversion by a State Member, or the dispatch, of its aircraft-carriers and sophisticated military aircraft to an area of tension.

113. Ghana would like to draw attention to the inherent dangers of such actions. It would be unfortunate if the world community discerned or condoned the notion of a super-Power provoking or threatening a small country. Ghana, as a small country, cannot but look with concern at actions which might carry such implications, or at the very least convey that impression.

114. As a member of the OAU, Ghana cannot rejoice in military activities off the coast of the continent which were intended to provoke and threaten a sister country. It is against the concept of our collective unity and should not be allowed to recur. It is also important for me to state the position of my country, as a member of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, that we cannot be silent over the injustice nor tolerate the threat that was involved in the active confrontation between a super-Power and a small and weak fellow non-aligned country. It is a fact that if the international community is to assure itself of peace and security, then the objectives of such regional organizations should not be needlessly disregarded, as was the case last week.

115. Furthermore, it should be underscored that the security of a region, particularly the explosive Mediterranean area, should first and foremost be the responsibility of the countries of the region and not the unilateral and desperate decision of a country outside the region, however militarily significant.

116. In this context, the United States Administration should take friendly cognizance of the extreme sensitivity of all developing countries to strong-arm tactics by the great Powers. Our memories are too painfully full of such actions taken in the past in all the regions of the world against weaker countries by the stronger nations of the world.

117. The incidents of last week clearly bear out the concern expressed last year by the Secretary-General, when he called for greater support for the United Nations in order to avert international anarchy. The United Nations has the machinery for dealing swiftly and meaningfully with such matters, and it must be relied upon, especially by its Member States, rather than be set aside

in favour of unilateral military confrontation, which can only precipitate threats to international peace and security.

118. Ghana, which has traditionally been a strong advocate of dialogue and the peaceful resolution of disputes between States, would like at this point to launch an appeal to all parties to this situation to avoid military brinkmanship and find peaceful methods to resolve their differences. In this regard, we note that in his statement the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya mentioned the willingness of his country to enter into dialogue with the United States [*ibid.*]. We hope this offer will be taken up with a view to seeking a peaceful solution.

119. Ghana appeals to all parties to act with restraint and to make the fullest possible use of existing regional and subregional organizations to bring about the peaceful resolution of differences.

120. We live today in an international environment so fraught with grave dangers that it would be tragic to add to them unnecessarily, as would be the case if this situation were allowed to escalate.

The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.

NOTES

[1] *Official Records of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea*, vol. XVII (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.84.V.2), document A/CONF.62/122.

[2] General Assembly resolution 2625 (XXV), annex.

[3] General Assembly resolution 2734 (XXV).

[4] General Assembly resolution 36/103, annex.

Litho in United Nations, New York 00300 60205—November 1990—2,050

UNITED NATIONS

SECURITY COUNCIL
OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-EIGHTH YEAR

2418th MEETING: 23 FEBRUARY 1983

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2418)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
Letter dated 19 February 1983 from the Permanent Representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/15615)	1

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/ . . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements* of the *Official Records of the Security Council*. The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*. The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

2418th MEETING

Held in New York on Wednesday, 23 February 1983, at 3.30 p.m.

President: Mr. Oleg Aleksandrovich TROYANOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics).

Present: The representatives of the following States: China, France, Guyana, Jordan, Malta, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Poland, Togo, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zaire, Zimbabwe.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2418)

1. Adoption of the agenda

2. Letter dated 19 February 1983 from the Permanent Representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/15615)

The meeting was called to order at 4.30 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Letter dated 19 February 1983 from the Permanent Representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/15615)

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): In accordance with the decision taken by the Council at previous meetings [*2415th and 2417th meetings*], I invite the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya to take a place at the Council table; I invite the representatives of Benin, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Egypt, the German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Hungary, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Madagascar, the Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic and Viet Nam to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Burwin (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) took a place at the Council table; Mr. Soglo (Benin), Mr. Suja (Czechoslovakia), Mr. Al-Ashtal (Democratic Yemen), Mr. Khalil (Egypt), Mr. Ott (German Democratic Republic), Mr. Gbeho (Ghana), Mr. Rácz (Hungary), Mr. Rajaie-Khorassani (Islamic Republic of Iran), Mr. Rabetafika (Madagascar) Mr. Abdalla (Sudan), Mr. El-Fattal (Syrian Arab Republic) and Mr. Le Kim Chung (Viet Nam) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

2. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): I would like to inform members of the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Algeria, Bulgaria, Cuba and Ethiopia in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the agenda. In conformity with the usual practice and with the consent of the Council, I propose to invite those representatives to take part in the discussion, without the right to vote, in accordance with Article 31 of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Abada (Algeria), Mr. Tsvetkov (Bulgaria), Mr. Roa Kourí (Cuba), and Mr. Ibrahim (Ethiopia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

3. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): I would like to inform members of the Council that I have received a letter dated 23 February from the representative of Togo [*S/15621*], which reads as follows:

> "I have the honour to request the Security Council to extend an invitation, under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure, to Mr. Ike F. Mafole, the representative of the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania, to participate in the consideration of the item entitled: 'Letter dated 19 February 1983 from the Permanent Representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council' (S/15615)."

If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Council agrees to this request.

It was so decided.

4. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): The first speaker is the representative of Hungary. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

5. Mr. RACZ (Hungary): Comrade President, first of all I should like to express my sincere thanks to you and, through you, to the members of the Council for inviting my delegation to participate in the Council's deliberations and for giving me the opportunity to express our view with regard to the important issue on the agenda.

6. At the same time, it gives me great pleasure to congratulate you, Comrade President, on your assumption of the presidency for the month of February. It is my

firm conviction that the guidance of a highly qualified and respected diplomat from a country to which my country is connected by bonds of friendship and close co-operation will greatly help the Council contribute to the maintenance of international peace and security.

7. Since this is the first time I have spoken in the Council this year, I should like to avail myself of the opportunity to greet the new members; I wish the delegations of Malta, the Netherlands, Nicaragua, Pakistan and Zimbabwe much success in their highly responsible assignment.

8. This series of urgent meetings of the Council has been called to consider yet another act that could further aggravate the generally tense international situation. The recent attempts to intimidate the people and the Government of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya give us cause for concern. The dispatch of AWACS aircraft to one of the neighbouring countries and the deployment of the aircraft-carrier *Nimitz* in close proximity to the Libyan coast, the latest manifestations of a series of anti-Libyan manoeuvres, constitute acts of provocation and amount to a military threat. This unprovoked step of the United States Administration and the hysteria that accompanied it clearly demonstrate that some of the influential factors of international politics still keep on stubbornly ignoring the genuine interests of mankind and the corresponding wish of world public opinion to alleviate international tension and promote the spirit of mutual understanding among nations, and that, instead, they repeatedly resort to provocations. By doing so, these circles deliberately poison the international atmosphere.

9. The contradictions in the various statements that have been made to try to justify the unjustifiable—contradictions which are all too well known to all of us here—shed even more light on the real nature and purposes of these manoeuvres. These prevarications have obviously failed to make anyone believe in the alleged danger and in the necessity of the so-called deterrent measures.

10. Thanks to the patience and self-restraint exercised by the Libyan Government, the provocation has not resulted in an open conflict in this particular case. But the danger has always been there. And no one can lose sight of the possibility that such provocations might lead to unpredictable consequences, might jeopardize the stability of the region in question and threaten international peace and security as a whole. It must be clear to everyone that once this happens, he who has provoked the act should bear all the responsibility for its consequences.

11. The international community should deplore all kinds of provocation and must resolutely stand up against them. This kind of muscle-flexing should not be allowed to be repeated. The provisions of the Charter of the United Nations should be respected and the fundamental principles of international law and other norms of the international code of conduct should prevail in international relations.

12. Mr.SHAH NAWAZ (Pakistan): I wish first of all to avail myself of this opportunity to extend a warm welcome to our newest colleague on the Council, Mr. Abdullah Salah, the representative of Jordan, a country with which Pakistan enjoys close, brotherly relations. Mr. Salah brings with him a wealth of experience in the diplomatic field. We are confident that his wisdom and skills will be a great asset to the Council in its deliberations on the important issues that will come before it. We look forward to his contributions to the work of the Council and are ready to co-operate with him in our collective endeavours to strengthen the role of the Security Council in the promotion of international peace and security.

13. We have given careful consideration to the letter, dated 19 February, which the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya addressed to the President of the Council asking the Council to consider "the deteriorating situation near the Libyan shores". This letter and the earlier related communication from the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, dated 18 February [*S/15614*], draw attention to "the grave situation" resulting from the movement of the United States aircraft-carrier *Nimitz*, with some other naval vessels, close to the Libyan coast, and the dispatch of AWACS aircraft to a neighbouring country. It has been further stated that flights by United States reconnaissance aircraft and the use of jamming devices have created a dangerous situation and disrupted civil communications inside the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya. At the same time, an assurance has been given that the Jamahiriya does not have any intention of interfering in any country, whether a neighbour or a non-neighbour.

14. We have also studied carefully the letter, dated 22 February, addressed to the President of the Council by the representative of the United States [*S/15617*], rejecting Libyan charges and in turn making the allegation that Libya is interfering in the affairs of its neighbours, thus threatening the security of the region.

15. Yesterday [*2416th meeting*], the representative of the Sudan complained of interference by Libya in his country's internal affairs, interference aimed at overthrowing the legitimate Government of the country. He also considered the recent United States air and naval deployment as having been necessary.

16. The variety of the positions taken and the vehemence with which these have been advanced by the parties concerned are bewildering and render the task of the Council difficult. Nevertheless, all these statements deserve the Council's full attention.

17. Pakistan has consistently upheld the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and, both as a member and a non-member of the Council, has extended full support to it in the discharge of its heavy responsibilities. We earnestly believe that the maintenance of international peace and security imposes an inescapable obligation on all countries to adhere strictly to the principles of the Charter and, in particular, to refrain from interference in the affairs of other States and from the threat or use of

force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State. Any deviation from these principles, whether by a major Power or by a small country, cannot but have serious consequences for international peace and stability.

18. Our approach to the issue before the Council is guided by these considerations. It is also clear from the statements of the speakers who have participated in the debate that there is an overwhelming sentiment against all acts of interference in the internal affairs of sovereign States and against resort to the threat or use of force aimed at intimidating smaller countries.

19. The air and naval activities in the eastern Mediterranean have served to create fears concerning their impact on the security of States of the region. It is clear from the statements made by a number of countries from the region that such fears are shared by them. Pakistan is bound to take note of the expression of these fears.

20. We are deeply disturbed at the sequence of events which has culminated in the need for the Council to meet to consider the resulting situation, in which the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya feels a threat to its security. We earnestly hope that the consideration which the issues involved have received in the Council's debate will help defuse the situation and bring about a lessening of the tension that has been generated.

21. It is our hope that States Members of the United Nations will feel encouraged to have recourse to the Council whenever they perceive a threat to their security, instead of resorting to the threat or use of force to achieve their objectives. Only in this way will the Council be enabled to function as an effective instrument for the maintenance of international peace and security, as it is intended to be in accordance with the role assigned to it by the Charter: an aspect to which the report of the Secretary-General on the work of the Organization submitted to the General Assembly at its most recent session[1] draws particular attention. This role will be denied to the United Nations if countries decide to arrogate to themselves the role which properly belongs to the Security Council.

22. We appeal to all the parties concerned to cooperate in taking steps to reduce tension in the region and to avoid any precipitate action which might endanger international peace and security. In this respect, we welcome the reassuring statements made yesterday by the representatives of Libya and the United States [*2415th meeting*]. We find in these statements a reaffirmation of their commitment to the principles of the Charter, particularly the principle of non-intervention in the internal affairs of States.

23. In view of these statements and of the latest developments in the area, we are hopeful that the situation in the region will soon revert to normalcy. We also hope that the present debate in the Council will contribute to the achievement of that desirable goal and will inhibit the recurrence of situations like the one now being considered by the Council.

24. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): The next speaker is the representative of Bulgaria, whom I invite to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

25. Mr. TSVETKOV (Bulgaria) (*interpretation from French*): Comrade President, at the very outset I should like to thank you, as well as all the members of the Council, for giving me the opportunity to state the position of my Government concerning the item on the agenda.

26. I should like to say at once, Comrade President, how pleased we are to see you presiding over the work of the Council during the month of February. I am particularly pleased since you represent a great country with which the People's Republic of Bulgaria enjoys the closest, most fraternal, relations. The fact that your country pursues, in a most consistent manner, a policy of peace and progress, and the fact that you have such political wisdom and diplomatic skill, which are recognized by all, will help see to it that the Council can fulfil its responsibilities.

27. I should like to pay a tribute also to the representative of Togo for the outstanding way in which he presided over the work of the Council during January.

28. The events which recently took place in the region of the Mediterranean Sea have again shown that the explosive situation prevailing there is by no means the result of some sort of historical or geopolitical predetermination. It is the result of a well-thought-out strategy which seeks to paralyse progressive change in the Middle East, perpetuate the exploitation of the natural riches of that region by capitalist monopolies and impose the military and strategic supremacy of imperialism in that geographical area, situated at the crossroads of the three continents of the Old World.

29. The provocative manoeuvres against the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya are evidence of the extremes to which the United States Government has gone in its ambition to point the unfolding of events in the region in a direction which would favour its imperialist interests.

30. The People's Republic of Bulgaria resolutely condemns that act of aggression and believes that it constitutes an attempt to impose the Camp David deals by brute force, to deepen the scission in the Arab world and to compel it to capitulate to the hegemonistic designs of imperialism and Zionist reaction. We cannot fail to point out that the perpetrators of that act of provocation seek to create a smoke-screen to conceal the continued expansionist manoeuvres of Tel Aviv and to distract world public opinion from the Sabra and Shatila crimes.

31. The latest anti-Libyan venture is significant in that it shows the existence of a new plan to destabilize the region and to dismantle the national liberation movement in that part of the world.

32. The ambitions of a large State wilfully to assume the role of arbiter of the security of a region thousands of kilometres away from it have caused particularly grave concern within the international community. The worst examples in history, both recent and remote, attest to the fact that that State arrogates to itself the right to survey and sanction the sovereign acts of States as well as their domestic and foreign policies. The obstinacy with which it pursues that policy reveals a total disregard for the realities of our time and a blind attachment to the instruments of force and destruction. There is no need to dwell in detail on where such aspirations could lead.

33. The danger is particularly great given the deliberate intention to raise the level of confrontation in a region that is particularly sensitive, both politically and militarily. The blackmail carried out against the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya is an open defiance of the attempts being made to arrive at a peaceful and just solution to the differences that exist in the region. It also constitutes a further step towards a universalization of the Middle East crisis. The action was undertaken within the context of massive military and psychological pressure brought to bear against all the progressive forces in the world. Indeed, it represents a restoration of the grimly familiar 1950s policy of brinkmanship.

34. I should like to stress that the events that have just occurred in the region around Libya bring out once again the urgent need to arrive at a comprehensive and just solution to the Middle East problem. The unhappy experience of many military conflicts has shown that such problems cannot be resolved by *diktat*, armed confrontation and acts of aggression. Nor can such a solution be achieved through separate deals, by pitting the Arab countries against each other. The solution can be reached only through the collective efforts of all the parties concerned. The People's Republic of Bulgaria, together with the other socialist countries, has always favoured the convening at the earliest possible date of a broad, international representative forum to that end.

35. There is no doubt that all States are duty-bound to abide, both in their policies in the Mediterranean region and in their international relations in general, by the principles of non-use of force, non-interference in the internal affairs of other States, equality of rights and the right of peoples to decide their own future.

36. Accordingly, while reaffirming our total support for the just cause of the Libyan people and condemning imperialist aggression against it, my country expresses its willingness to co-operate with all those who sincerely desire the establishment of lasting peace and security in the region of the Middle East and the Mediterranean.

37. Mr. SALAH (Jordan) (*interpretation from Arabic*): Since this is the first time I have spoken in the Council as the representative of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, I should like to begin by personally extending to you, Sir, my warmest congratulations on your assumption of the presidency for the current month.

38. I should also like to take this opportunity to express my sincere thanks and gratitude for the warm welcome that you and other members of the Council have extended to me. I need not emphasize my personal pleasure at representing my country in this august body. I look forward to good relations of co-operation and fruitful endeavour with all of my colleagues, and I pledge my personal co-operation and that of my delegation.

39. I need not emphasize Jordan's concern at the developments that have taken place during the last few days in the Mediterranean area and North Africa and that have led to the submission by the fraternal country of Libya of its complaint to the Council. Those developments have clearly created a situation of tension and danger in that region, tension and danger that have spread beyond the regional level to the international level. Our concern and interest with regard to those developments are based on the existence of mutual relations between Jordan and the countries concerned in the present crisis. Jordan is linked to Libya and the Sudan by Pan Arabist commitments and common destiny, belonging as we do to the same regional group, the League of Arab States. We have a clear sense of our Pan Arabist responsiblities and national obligations towards the Arab nation and its just causes. In addition to being part of the Islamic world and the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, we are also bound to the international community through bilateral relations and mutual co-operation within the framework of serving common interests and safeguarding the principles of peace, security and legality throughout the world.

40. Notwithstanding the divergent views as to the causes of the tension that came into being last week around the borders of Libya and other neighbouring States, and irrespective of the pros and cons of the present crisis on the regional and international levels, my Government believes that it is in the interest of none of the parties to internationalize Arab affairs; therefore, the transfer of such issues to the international arena will serve only to aggravate them further, making them more complex and leading to a polarization in the region that will result in more suffering for the Arab nation. Such a course can only serve to weaken further the bases of Arab solidarity and co-operation and lead to a concomitant increase in the tension that exists in international relations.

41. Jordan's foreign policy is based on the principle of opposition to interference in the internal and external affairs of nations on the part of any party in any circumstances and for any reason whatsoever, and in any form or manifestation. On that basis we cannot accept threats to the security of any State from outside its borders. Responsibility for safeguarding the sovereignty and security of each State is an absolute right of the concerned State; the safeguarding of international peace and security is an international responsibility exercised by the United Nations through the Security Council.

42. Israel has continuously threatened the security of Arab States, as well as their territorial integrity, launching many attacks and invasions and committing acts of

aggression. Moreover, for over 15 years Israel has been occupying Jerusalem and the West Bank, as well as Gaza and the Golan Heights.

43. Despite the numerous resolutions adopted by the United Nations, foremost among which is Council resolution 242 (1967), Israel has failed to implement a single one and has refused to heed the international call for its withdrawal from all the occupied Arab territories, for the establishment of a just and comprehensive peace in the area, and recognition of the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people. Nor has there been any successful attempt to compel it to do so.

44. Jordan opposes the threat or use of force in international relations and, in conformity with this policy, calls for respect for international norms and instruments which make it incumbent upon States to strive to settle their disputes amicably and by peaceful means, avoiding provocative acts and extremist policies and practices.

45. All countries bear special responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, the safeguarding of stability and the development of co-operation all over the world. That responsibility requires all States to abstain from any action that could lead to tension in international relations; it implies the need to proceed on the basis of the principle of safeguarding the atmosphere of détente, international co-operation, non-intervention in the internal affairs of others and respect for good-neighbourliness.

46. There are certain practices that, on the one hand, might not serve the dignity and reputation of various countries and, on the other, might prompt smaller countries to go to extremes or to try to form blocs. There are also grave risks that the great Powers may conduct their foreign policies on the assumption that peaceful coexistence and détente cannot be achieved.

47. In conclusion, we realize the importance of respecting the right of every State to exercise its sovereignty within the framework of choosing and implementing its own foreign policy; to formulate its international relations in order to safeguard its security and territorial integrity; and to use every legitimate means to that end. National and regional stability is synonymous with international stability and progress. Indeed, the national security of every State should be respected by all members of the international community.

48. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): The next speaker is the representative of Ethiopia, whom I invite to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

49. Mr. IBRAHIM (Ethiopia): Allow me at the outset, Sir, to offer my congratulations to you on your assumption of the presidency for the month of February. Your personal diplomatic skills and the policy of peace pursued by your Government augur well for the successful discharge of your responsibilities.

50. I should also like to take this opportunity to express my delegation's sincere appreciation to the representative of brotherly Togo for the efficient manner in which he presided over the affairs of the Council last month.

51. Last but not least, I should like to congratulate the new members of the Council and to wish them success in the fulfilment of the high hopes we have all reposed in them.

52. Today the Council is once again meeting to consider a situation in which the might of a super-Power is being imposed on the will of a small nation to deny it the right to chart its destiny free from foreign domination. Some might wittingly or unwittingly view the agenda item before the Council today as representating a conflict situation between two neighbouring States, but the facts belie that point of view. If the issue had been an imminent threat emanating from one African country against another, neighbouring African country, as some would like us to believe, surely the countries of the region themselves would have been able to contain that threat. But the fact that the colossal might of a super-Power has been deployed so swiftly compels us to look for reasons other than those advanced by the representative of the United States in her statement to the Council yesterday [*ibid.*].

53. As is well known, the present United States Administration has publicly and unequivocally stated on numerous occasions the high priority it attaches to what it characterizes as "the containment of Libyan adventurism"—which actually means the overthrow of the legitimate Government of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya. Indeed, for the last two years the United States Administration has pursued this objective with uncharacteristic consistency and determination. That, we submit, is the real source of the tension on the northern shores of Africa, and therefore no amount of sophistry can alter that incontrovertible fact.

54. When we say that, we are not, of course, oblivious to or denying the fact that there are differences and difficulties between Libya and some of its neighbours, but we are convinced that those differences are not the real source of the present tension in that part of the world. Those differences can and will be resolved by the countries concerned, bilaterally or through the instrumentality of regional organizations. Unfortunately, however, the differences are being deliberately fanned in order to serve as a pretext for intervention in and ultimate domination of that region.

55. In this connection, let me refer to a simple and very recent example of how the United States pursues a policy in the region that could be characterized as one of "divide and dominate". In her statement to the Council, the representative of the United States stated that: "A number of Libyans are in Ethiopia advising Somali and Sudanese guerrillas." [*Ibid., para. 66*]. We, of course, view that as malicious. What makes that statement noteworthy, however, is not its lack of scruples but the sinister motive that lies behind it.

56. The whole world knows that Ethiopia and Somalia have strained relations. But what the world probably does not know is how the United States exploits these strained relations in order to maintain military bases and facilities in our region. The whole world also knows that Ethiopia and the Sudan enjoy very good relations and that both countries are striving to strengthen further that good-neighbourliness at the highest possible level. Unfortunately, the United States is not happy with this state of affairs and, as has been attempted here by its representative, is sowing seeds of distrust and discord in the bilateral relations of those sister nations.

57. In this connection, I wish to state that not only are there no Sudanese guerrillas being trained by Libya in my country but even the Sudanese Government itself has not made such charges against my country. When viewed against this background, the motive behind the statement of the United States representative should become very apparent. And, we submit again, the purpose is to raise suspicion, create tension and strain the good-neighbourly relations that exist beween the people and Government of my country and the people and Government of the Sudan. The statements and actions of the United States should therefore be viewed at all times within the context of its guiding policy of divide and dominate.

58. Being a permanent member of the Security Council obviously entails primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. At this point in time, if one asks the question how the policies of the present United States Administration measure up to its responsibilities under the Charter of the United Nations, the answer is not a difficult one. The global policy of peaceful coexistence and détente is today being replaced by a dangerous policy of confrontation; the cherished goal of disarmament is countered by extensive rearmament; the ardent desire for the creation of zones of peace in different regions of the world is being supplanted by a chain of military bases where intense military activity is taking place, albeit in the form of manoeuvres. Where wisdom and caution are imperative, Washington acts with haste and brinkmanship. Where responsibility and a sense of justice are expected, the world finds a singular lack of those qualities. One can go on enumerating the difficult situations in which the world finds itself as a result of the policy pursued by the present United States Administration.

59. Faced with such predicaments, what should the Security Council do to discharge its Charter responsibilities? Indeed, what should small countries like Libya expect from the Council when a super-Power threatens to exercise its military might against it? Those are some of the questions that the members of the Council have to address. As for the Ethiopian delegation and Government, we commend Libya for its courage and perseverance in the face of the boundless might and ceaseless provocations of a nuclear Power. At the same time, we continue to hope that the dictates of world peace and security, rather than narrowly conceived national interests, will one day be given due consideration by the Government of the United States. When that takes place, at some future date, it will certainly mark a significant turn of events in favour of the maintenance of global peace and stability and the enhancement of international co-operation in promoting progress and prosperity for mankind as a whole.

60. There is no denying, however, that such positive developments uncertain and unspecified as they are, will not provide a solution to the present situation, which is so replete with all the possibilities for escalating into a conflagration. The present dangerous situation and the tension that mounted dramatically last week in and around the northern shores of Africa appear to be the result of a deliberate plan and the culmination of a whole series of hostile and provocative acts committed by the United States against the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya. We shall not burden the Council by restating those facts, as a whole inventory of those provocations over the past several years was given only yesterday by the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya [*ibid., para. 14*].

61. The statement of the representative of the United States not only has failed to assure us that the present crisis is over but in fact has added to the confusion generated by the contradictory statements of high officials in Washington, including the President of the United States himself.

62. The official Government statement from Khartoum, as reported in *The Washington Post* of 21 February, is that there had been no *coup* attempt and that only 25 persons had been arrested over the past three months. The Egyptian Minister for Defence was also reported in the same newspaper as having asserted that he did not see any signs of crisis or a possible aggression against the Sudan at present. Also, no joint military manoeuvres have been confirmed by the countries concerned; in fact, they have been denied outright. Yet, those were the justifications offered by the United States for the dangerous military activities that it undertook.

63. However, *The New York Times*, in its issue of 22 February, touched upon what appears to be the more likely and, indeed, the most disturbing currents underneath the high drama of last week. It reported that:

> "The plan, according to the American officials, was to lure Libya into striking and then to destroy as much of its air force as possible. If no strike occurred, the plan was to assert that prompt help to Egypt had deterred Libya."

The same *New York Times* article continued:

> "The cover story was to be that the AWACS planes had been sent to Egypt as part of a training exercise."

It was further stressed that:

> "The apparent contradictions in the public posture and the private explanations, officials said, were due more to poor execution than to a faulty plan."

In other words, it was a good plan with poor implementation.

64. Thus the aircraft-carrier *Nimitz,* with its sophisticated, deadly weapons, was diverted to the shores of Libya on a mission of fishing for a pretext that would provide a semblance of justification for clobbering a weak and small country. What is even more disturbing is the fact that this was done by a super-Power, a permanent member of the Security Council, which has responsibility for maintaining international peace and security, for protecting the weak and the small and for promoting the rule of law in international relations.

65. Indeed, the world is approaching a new international anarchy, as was emphatically expressed by the Secretary-General in his report on the work of the Organization, submitted to the thirty-seventh session of the General Assembly.[1] What reason do we have for optimism when a permanent member of the Council, the organ in which the Charter of the United Nations reposes special responsibilities for maintaining world order, is arrogating to itself the role of international policeman or, worse, is acting as a lawless gang bullying the weak and the small?

66. For our part, our response to that can only be to call for prudence and to urge all States concerned to conduct themselves in accordance with the norms of international law, as enunciated in the Charter. The alternative to prudence and the rule of law is not only dangerous but also irreversible.

67. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): The next speaker is the representative of Cuba. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

68. Mr. ROA KOURI (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): A little more than a year ago, in August 1981, the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Non-Aligned Countries held an extraordinary meeting in New York to consider the grave situation created by the provocative naval manoeuvres carried out by the United States Navy near the coasts of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya. Those manoeuvres, obviously carried out for intimidatory purposes, resulted in the shooting down of Libyan aircraft by the United States Air Force. The Co-ordinating Bureau regarded those actions on the part of a permanent member of the Security Council, which has, as we know, primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, as a series of threats to the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of the non-aligned countries of the region, which advocate the creation of a zone of peace and co-operation in the Mediterranean.

69. The Council is today considering the dangerous situation arising from the new provocative actions of the United States Navy in the vicinity of Libya and the dispatch of AWACS spy planes to a neighbouring country. Indeed, the most powerful imperial Power of our time is striving to intimidate a small, non-aligned country, accusing it of dark plans against its Arab neighbours, which not only are not threatened by Libya, but whose peoples are linked by historical and indissoluble ties of brotherhood and by battles waged in common against the Zionist régime of Israel, colonialism and imperialism.

70. The actions today of the United States are nothing but a repetition of the 1981 occurrences. The propaganda campaign unleashed by the United States mass media against Libya is an attempt purely and simply to disguise and justify the aggressive policy of Washington against the Libyan revolution, against its position of anti-imperialism, independence and solidarity with the national liberation movements and the struggle of peoples for their national and social emancipation.

71. Cubans cannot be surprised at such conduct. For, at the end of the last century, **José Martí**, the founder of our independence, conceived his struggle for freedom as a means of preventing the nascent imperialism of the Yankees from being unleashed—with the force that had taken possession of Cuba—against the territories of Latin America. Therefore, in the Buenos Aires newspaper *La Nación,* following the first Pan American Conference, held in Washington, he warned our peoples against the hegemonistic designs of their powerful neighbour and said that the time for its second independence had come for Latin America.

72. **Simón Bolívar**, the great fighter for Latin American liberty, had exclaimed with singular far-sightedness several decades before this that: "The United States seems to be destined by providence to beset Latin America with miseries in the name of liberty."

73. It is of course, again, in the name of liberty—which for the Indians of the United States is the liberty to take refuge in their tiny concentration camps on reservations; which for the black people of that country is the liberty to live in ghettos, be discriminated against, downtrodden and persecuted; which for millions of Latin Americans, Africans and Asians is the liberty, purely and simply, to die of hunger, malnutrition or disease; liberty to be enjoyed only by the great monopolists and their most outstanding representatives—it is, I repeat, in the name of liberty that the Government of the United States has come forward in the role of policeman of the world.

74. I would like to know what principle in the Charter of the United Nations authorizes the Government of the United States to impose unilaterally an economic blockade, already 23 years old, on my country. What Article of the Charter authorizes it to organize, train and finance mercenaries to destabilize Nicaragua and Grenada? What precept of international law is invoked for sending its fleet to the coast of Libya, to the Indian Ocean, to South Korea and to the Caribbean and to maintain military bases throughout the world, even against the will of the peoples concerned, as is the case of the naval base which is being illegally maintained on Cuban territory in Guantánamo?

75. The members of the Council may perhaps have a good answer to my questions. Since I do not want to be guilty of ingenuousness, I wish to make clear that the questions are purely rhetorical. We all know that no one asked the Government of the United States to become the world's policeman and that it has no right to assume that role, either under the Charter or in international law. More than one President of the United States has already admitted this. Yet the United States does all this; it interferes, when it deems it necessary, in the internal affairs of States Members of the United Nations in the name of its sacrosanct interests.

76. This is the strange way the imperialists have of confusing everything and distorting values and principles. That is one thing. But it is another thing to claim that independent, sovereign States should share the misguided vision of the world and of international relations of the United States. None of our countries, regardless of its size or power—or lack of power—is ready to yield an inch in defence of its principles, sovereignty, independence and the freedom to chart its own destiny.

77. We are no longer in the era of the gunboat. The Davids of the world today do not fear Goliath, although he may possess nuclear warheads. Therefore, once again we wish today to express our unswerving solidarity with the Libyan people and with its inalienable right to direct its own destiny without any outside interference or intervention. Therefore, we vigorously condemn the aggressive policy of the United States Government against a member of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, and we call to the attention of members of the Council this grave situation, which, together with the repeated acts of aggression by Israel against the Arab nation, jeopardizes international peace and security.

78. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): The next speaker is the representative of Algeria. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

79. Mr. ABADA (Algeria) (*interpretation from French*): I thank you, Sir, for permitting me to speak in the Council. Although the Algerian delegation has already paid you the tribute you deserve as President, I should like, in my turn, to express to you the sincere pleasure I have in addressing the Council under your distinguished presidency.

80. Algeria cannot remain indifferent to events which, for several days now, have been occurring in the Mediterranean region, an Arab and African region, which is Algeria's own immediate geographical and political environment and to which it is attached by so many links. The Algerian delegation therefore believes it to be entirely legitimate, urgent and important for the Council to meet to examine the deterioration of the situation in the vicinity of the Libyan coast. We should like to take this opportunity to recall Algeria's position of unswerving principle in the consideration of the events which caused this matter to be presented to the Council by a neighbour and fraternal country.

81. The movements of a powerful unit of the United States aircraft-carrier fleet in the Gulf of Sidra and the dangers that this poses to the countries of the area confirm the correctness of the traditional policy of Algeria to do everything possible to make of the Mediterranean a sea of peace, co-operation and understanding among the coastal countries and a zone free from all external threats, a zone of peace, security and independence for the countries and the peoples of the region. This policy has been constantly endorsed and confirmed by the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, to which the great majority of the island and coastal countries of the Mediterranean belong.

82. The argument of joint manoeuvres by a Power outside the region and a country inside the region—whether this be in the Mediterranean or elsewhere—cannot be accepted as a valid explanation. Such exercises, precisely because they occur in sensitive areas, inevitably carry with them the risk of confrontation and destabilization, while at the same time placing regional conflicts within a much broader framework of confrontation.

83. Whatever the reality and complexity of the problems confronting the countries of the region, there can be no justification for intervention or the threat of intervention by a Power from outside the region. In this part of the Arab world, which is also part of the African world, it is deplorable that there should have been such interventions at a time when dangerous actions are undertaken to weaken and undermine the bases of regional organizations, which are the natural forums for the examination of the problems of a region and for the search for peaceful solutions.

84. In the face of the paralysis of these regional organizations, which are those that truly regulate international life, in accordance with the very spirit of the Charter of the United Nations, the Security Council remains the ultimate recourse for safeguarding international peace and security and for deterring and condemning any action which might undermine it. In this particular grave situation before the Council today, Algeria wishes to express the hope that the Council will live up to its responsibilities.

85. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): In accordance with the decision taken at the start of this meeting, I invite the representative of the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania, Mr. Mafole, to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

86. Mr. MAFOLE: Mr. President, on behalf of the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania (PAC), the custodian of the true aspirations of the oppressed and exploited African majority of Azania, I wish to thank you and the members of the Council for permitting us to make a statement in solidarity with the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya.

87. We also take this opportunity to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency for the month of February, we are confident that under your able lead-

ership the Council will objectively examine the facts as presented and take appropriate measures in order to uphold peace and security in that region.

88. The PAC, on behalf of the oppressed and exploited people of Azania, denounces in the strongest terms possible the United States imperialist aggression against the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya.

89. United States imperialist warmongers are at it again. It will be remembered that the same aggressive activities were carried out in 1981. The aim of this imperialist provocation and aggression remains the same: to further the strategic designs of the United States for global domination and continued exploitation of the world's peoples. It is becoming more and more explicit that the United States wants to create a state of permanent instability in the Mediterranean so as to further its exploitative interests in the region. This obviously poses a serious threat to international peace and stability.

90. It is an historical fact that the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya has consistently been in the vanguard of the struggle against the imperialism led by the United States both in Africa and the Middle East. The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya continues to support, materially, politically and diplomatically, the struggles of the peoples of Namibia and Azania against *apartheid*, colonialism and imperialism. The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya is also in the forefront of the struggle against Zionist Israel and whole-heartedly supports the progressive struggle of the Palestinian Arabs in occupied Palestine. All this commitment and dedication on the part of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya not only poses a threat to the imperialist interests of the United States in the two regions and hinders United States designs to penetrate the regions further, but also exposes the adventurist gunboat diplomacy of the present United States Administration, led by the most predatory and belligerent representatives of monopoly capitalism.

91. The United States hopes that it can save this situation by continuing its aggressive activities against Libya and hopes to bully and cow the militant Libyan people. Far from it. The PAC believes that, on the contrary, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya will continue playing its revolutionary role against United States imperialism in that region and elsewhere.

92. Finally, the PAC condemns, in the strongest terms possible, the United States aggression against the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, which is also an attack against the African revolution. We therefore express our unequivocal support for and revolutionary solidarity with the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya in its goal of maintaining its right of self-determination, national independence and international sovereignty.

93. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): I should now like to make a statement as the representative of the UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS.

94. The Council has been urgently convened to take up the worsening situation in the vicinity of Libya, the acts of provocation by the United States, which sent out ships of its Sixth Fleet to the coast of Libya, thus creating, as is stated in the letter from Libya, a threat to regional and international peace and security.

95. This is certainly not the first time that the United States Government has had recourse to armed acts of provocation against Libya, an independent, sovereign State and a Member of the United Nations. The events of August 1981, when American fighters shot down two Libyan aeroplanes over the Gulf of Sidra, are still sufficiently fresh in everyone's memory. For some years now, the authorities in Washington have been pursuing a systematic campaign of threats and intimidation against Libya and its leaders.

96. The leaders of the United States Government are always spreading fabrications about Libya's independent foreign policy, which is obviously not to the liking of the architects of American policy. They clearly find unpalatable the fact that Libya is pursuing an anti-imperialist policy in international affairs and is decisively opposing attempts by the United States and Israel to force a capitulatory peace on the Arab peoples.

97. That is precisely why the American fleet was in the vicinity of the Libyan coast, whereas Washington once again dredged up the hackneyed propagandistic canard about a Libyan threat to neighbouring countries and, one would almost believe, to the United States itself.

98. This clearly points to the serious consequences of the imperialist policy of the United States in the Middle East. That policy seeks to militarize the region, to expand the direct American military presence there and to interfere in the affairs of States of the region. In places beyond the reach of the strategic ally of the United States, Israel, Washington immediately turns up as a self-styled arbiter, shamelessly trying to dictate its conditions to other countries.

99. And here I should like to remind the Council of what Mr. Gromyko, the Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union, said at the thirty-seventh session of the General Assembly:

> "Who, we might well ask, has given Washington the right to tell sovereign States what they should and what they should not do in their own house? Who has given it the right to try to punish those who cherish their sovereignty and would not yield to pressure, to apply all kinds of sanctions, to impose economic blockades, and even to brandish arms?
>
> "From what some say, it would appear that United States interests are being endangered almost everywhere in the world. This is an absurd thesis. Yet it is being used to justify crude interference in the affairs of others, used on a sweeping geographic scale, as regards both nearby countries and those situated

many thousands of kilometres away from the United States."[2]

100. Those words admirably sum up the present policy of the United States in respect of Libya.

101. To judge by the statement made by the Secretary of State of the United States, it was only thanks to the "speedy, decisive actions" of the United States Administration that the threat to international peace was averted, a threat which was allegedly posed to Libya's neighbours. The question is: What threat are we talking about? The Egyptian Defence Minister, Mr. Abu-Ghazala, said, according to reports, that he saw no signs of crisis or possible aggression from Libya. It would seem that this time, as indeed in the past, the latest mirage about the Libyan danger was born not in the sun-baked sands of the Sahara but in the cauldron of the propaganda kitchen of the Administration in Washington.

102. Witness, too, the clumsy attempts by United States officials to try to smooth over the glaring contradictions in the hastily concocted version of recent events which seeks to justify the sending of the United States fleet to the coast of Libya. At a press conference on 17 February, the President of the United States stated that there were no movements of the fleet towards Libya. At the same time, other representatives of the Administration—in an attempt, as it were, to correct their President—acknowledged the presence of the United States fleet near the Libyan coast but stated that this had nothing at all to do with Libya. Now, the Administration would have us believe that it was only this decisive action it undertook that led to a lessening of the danger. Everything becomes clear if we take a look at the articles in American newspapers which shed real light on Washington's intentions. According to an article in *The New York Times*, which specifically names United States officials, the Administration's plan was to provoke Libya and then to destroy its air force. Certain representatives have already quoted this article, but I considered it my duty to refer to it again in my statement.

103. There is another aspect of these recent events which should not be forgotten. The question is: Is Libya the only target of United States attempts to wave the big stick? No one can seriously believe that that State, with a population of about 2.5 million, could be a threat to the United States. Would it not be closer to the truth to say that the actions of the Administration are aimed against all non-aligned countries, particularly those that do not want to go along with the hegemonistic policies of the United States? It would seem that that country wants to make it clear to them too that if gross slander cannot prevail upon them to change their independent policies, the United States always has at the ready warships and planes to teach them a good lesson and to restore "order", cooked up from colonial recipes concocted in Washington.

104. The Soviet delegation believes that this type of behaviour is inadmissible in relations between States. The United States action was aimed at subverting the basis of international relations and at gross interference in the affairs of others, and it constitutes a serious threat to world peace, leading to a further exacerbation of tension in that already explosive region of the Middle East. An end must be put immediately to such acts of provocation against Libya.

105. I now resume my functions as PRESIDENT.

106. Mr. LICHENSTEIN (United States of America): As frequently happens in the proceedings of the Council, the apparent focus of its attention tends, under the harsh blows of rhetoric and inflamed passion, distortion and misrepresentation, to sink, like the proverbial stone, without a trace.

107. My delegation has been particularly impressed by some of the presentations made in the course of this discussion—which we had thought was a discussion of the unstable situation in and around the area occupied by Libya. We were struck by the noble sentiments expressed in behalf of noninterference in the affairs of others by the representative of Viet Nam, who is, of course, probably experienced in these matters, as the people of Kampuchea might attest. And even, Mr. President, at the risk of your well-known and richly deserved reputation for charm wearing somewhat thin, I was impressed by your statement, in view of the well-known activities of your Government in helping, I am sure, to stabilize the situation in Afghanistan with the neighbourly injection of upwards of 110,000 of your troops. But I thank you, Mr. President, as the representative of the Soviet Union, for putting a spotlight on what apparently is truly the issue before the Council, namely, in your words, Libya's "anti-imperialist policy in international affairs".

108. Well and good; we wish simply that Libya would take counsel as to whether it wants to apply its anti-imperialist policy against Chad and against the Sudan and against numerous other of its neighbours and, through its support and arms and finances to world-wide terrorist organizations, against other Governments and other peoples far, far beyond north-east and central Africa.

109. I said that the subject of our concern has tended to sink without a trace beneath the onslaughts of our rhetoric. Let me remind the Council of the subject of our concern, and let me read to the Council—particularly because its members and those who have asked to speak have paid a massive lack of attention to the detailed, concise, straightforward and utterly convincing statement delivered yesterday by the representative of the Sudan—from the transcript of the press conference held yesterday in Khartoum by Presidents Mubarak of Egypt and Nimeiri of the Su ...

> "President Nimeiri indicated that Qaddafi himself openly declared that he was intending to attack the Sudan on 18 February and was preparing for it . . .
>
> ". . .

"President Nimeiri said that Qaddafi told one of his agents that on the morning [*of 18 February*] he would send a TU aircraft to bomb Khartoum . . . Afterward, he tried to preoccupy world public opinion with anticipated moves against himself and submitted a complaint to the Security Council. By so doing [*Qaddafi*] was applying the proverb we use: 'He hits me and hastens to complain'."

What of the prospects for the future? President Nimeiri replied to another question on the current situation by saying:

"The threat from Libya against the Sudan is continuing. I believe that it will not stop for a long time because, for three years now, the Libyans have been really ready to attack the Sudanese Government and its President. Qaddafi has clearly said that he wants to change this Government and to do away with Nimeiri by all means, even if he has to kill him. He is working toward this end. What I want to say is that we are aware of his . . . plan."

President Mubarak of Egypt then added, at another point in the press conference:

"I believe that President Nimeiri has explained to you accurately everything that happened. Following the Sudan's discovery of the attempt against it, I do not believe that this attempt will be repeated."

110. It is the earnest hope and the profound wish of my Government, the motivation behind its recent acts of deterrence, our profound hope and prayer that President Mubarak will turn out to be a good prophet.

111. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): The representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya has asked to speak, and I now call on him.

112. Mr. BURWIN (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)(*interpretation from Arabic*): I should like in a few simple words to draw the attention of the representative of the United States to the following. If his country is concerned about spreading peace and righteousness in the world and about combating interference, we hope that his Government will deter Israel—not to mention South Africa, which interferes daily in the affairs of neighbouring African countries and applies the policy of racial discrimination against its own black majority. Is that in conformity with the principles of human rights that the United States claims to uphold, or are human rights—as Eliot Abrams, who is the United States official responsible for human rights, said—restricted to concern over those who oppose national Governments? Abrams also said: "The dissidents of today are the heads of State and the prime ministers of tomorrow."* This is the real secret of the United States interest in human rights.

113. The mission of the United States is to sow dissent among the Arabs. We assert that there is no genuine disagreement between the Libyan, Egyptian and Sudanese peoples because they are Arab peoples who share a common destiny, a common history and a common goal. There are many Egyptian and Sudanese brothers working in Libya. We are proud of the struggle of the Egyptian people for the cause of the Arab nation, and we are also proud of the struggle of the Sudanese people.

114. The representative of the United States is still asserting and maintaining that his country may interfere in the affairs of any country that might interfere in the affairs of its friends or agents. Let him call them what he likes. "Foreign intervention" might be acceptable. But what if we are dealing with internal affairs? Peoples have awakened; they do not wish to see their rulers as puppets of the United States, which is the enemy of the Arabs, the Palestinians, the Muslims and the oppressed peoples of South Africa.

115. I have one question: Is not the presence of the nuclear-powered aircraft-carrier *Nimitz*, near the Libyan coast, as reported in the American press, a violation of United Nations General Assembly resolutions and those of the Organization of African Unity that call for implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa?[3] Is not the presence of that nuclear-powered warship near the shores of Lebanon in contravention and violation of General Assembly resolutions that call for the establishment of a nuclear-free zone in the region of the Middle East? What is the fate of General Assembly resolutions that provide for the need to agree on effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons?

116. The United States representative mentioned that Libya finances terrorism or terrorist movements. A short while ago, the Council heard a statement by the representative of one of those organizations the United States deems to be terrorist, namely, the representative of the PAC, who spoke on behalf of the oppressed and the tortured. We hope that the United States will one day recognize the rights of those peoples.

117. There are many motives for the interference by the United States or for its having raised this issue. There are certain internal domestic motives that are inspired by the need to gain approval for the large sums of money to be devoted to the machinery of war and destruction. There are external motives as well, namely, the imposition of an American policy on the Middle East, the imposition of the Zionist entity upon the peoples of that region, the interference in Libya and the diversion of international public opinion from feelings that are inimical to the United States, especially on the continent of Europe, with regard to the issue of disarmament and the deployment of nuclear weapons in Europe.

118. Libya, Viet Nam and other States need no testimony from the United States. Some 26 representatives have made statements here. No fewer than 24 of them have taken the side of the Jamahiriya. Those who have made statements represent Asia, Europe, Latin America

* *Quoted in English by the speaker.*

and the struggling peoples in those regions. Because of its composition and structure, we do not expect anything from the Council, for we realize that, unfortunately, there is the United States veto power, a power that has come to be directed especially against Arab and African issues.

119. I should like to thank all those who showed concern over this issue, and I should like once again to state that Libya is a small country that wants to live in peace and to pursue a policy of non-alignment. It also wishes to establish normal relations with the peoples of all States, including the people of the United States. As the representative of Libya stated yesterday [*2415th meeting*], the Jamahiriya is prepared for dialogue and is ready to iron out differences, if any, with the Government of the United States.

The meeting rose at 6.10 p.m.

NOTES

[1] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-seventh Session, Supplement No. 1* (A/37/1).

[2] *Ibid., Plenary meetings*, 13th meeting, paras. 98 and 99.

[3] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twentieth Session, Annexes, agenda item 105, document A/5975.*

Litho in United Nations, New York 00300 60205—November 1990—2,050

UNITED NATIONS

SECURITY COUNCIL
OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-EIGHTH YEAR

2419th MEETING: 22 MARCH 1983

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2419)	1
Expression of thanks to the retiring President	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
Letter dated 16 March 1983 from the Permanent Representative of Chad to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/15643)	1

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/...) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements* of the *Official Records of the Security Council*. The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*. The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

2419th MEETING

Held in New York on Tuesday, 22 March 1983, at 4.15 p.m.

President: Sir John THOMSON (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland).

Present: The representatives of the following States: China, France, Guyana, Jordan, Malta, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Poland, Togo, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zaire, Zimbabwe.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2419)

1. Adoption of the agenda

2. Letter dated 16 March 1983 from the Permanent Representative of Chad to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/15643)

The meeting was called to order at 4.45 p.m.

Expression of thanks to the retiring President

1. The PRESIDENT: Since this is the first meeting of the Council for the month of March, I should like, on behalf of the Council, to pay a tribute to my predecessor, Mr. Oleg Aleksandrovich Troyanovsky, representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, for his service as President of the Council for the month of February. Mr. Troyanovsky guided the work of the Council last month with his usual accustomed great diplomatic skill. I am sure I speak for all members of the Council in expressing our deep appreciation for his work.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Letter dated 16 March 1983 from the Permanent Representative of Chad to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/15643)

2. The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Chad, the Ivory Coast, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Senegal and the Sudan, in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion, without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Miskine (Chad) and Mr. Treiki (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) took places at the Council table; Mr. Essy (Ivory Coast), Mr. Sarré (Senegal) and Mr. Abdalla (Sudan) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

3. The PRESIDENT: The Council is meeting today in response to the request contained in a letter dated 16 March 1983 from the representative of Chad to the President of the Security Council.

4. I should like to draw the attention of members of the Council to the following other documents: S/15644, which contains a letter dated 17 March from the representative of Chad to the President of the Council, transmitting a message from the President of the Republic of Chad; and S/15645, which contains a letter dated 17 March 1983 from the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya to the President of the Council.

5. Members of the Council also have before them photocopies of a letter dated 21 March from the representative of Chad to the President of the Council, which will be circulated as a document of the Council under the symbol S/15649.

6. The first speaker is the Minister for Foreign Affairs and Co-operation of Chad, Mr. Idriss Miskine. I welcome him and invite him to make his statement.

7. Mr. MISKINE (Chad) (*interpretation from French*): Before addressing the subject now before the Council, Sir, I should like to express to you, on behalf of my delegation, sincere congratulations on your assumption of the presidency for the month of March and, at the same time, to tell you how grateful we are for the expeditious manner in which you have convened the Council. My delegation is happy to see the representative of the United Kingdom, a country with which Chad maintains cordial and fruitful relations, presiding over the Council for this important period of the year. We are certain that, under your intelligent and dedicated guidance, and thanks to your outstanding qualities as a statesman and an experienced diplomat, the Council will be able to shoulder the difficult responsibilities assigned to it by the Charter of the United Nations.

8. I should also like to take this opportunity to pay a well-deserved tribute to your predecessor, the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, for the competent and dynamic way in which he directed the work of the Council last month.

9. I should also like most warmly to congratulate the newly elected members of the Council—Malta, the Netherlands, Nicaragua, Pakistan and Zimbabwe—and to wish them every success in their important work in the Council.

10. Lastly, I should like to express the deepest gratitude of all the people of Chad and of their Government to all the members of the Council for having responded so promptly to the appeal made to them by my country, Chad, and for having allowed me to address the Council.

11. If we have been compelled to request this urgent meeting of the Council, the principal body for safeguarding international peace and security, it is because we believe that the tension now prevailing between Chad and Libya is so serious and so explosive that if we are not careful it will inevitably disturb that peace and security which the international community so dearly needs.

12. The situation in Chad is serious and disturbing because of the outright intervention of the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya in Chad. That militarily over-equipped country has indeed taken it upon itself, in defiance of the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, the Charter of the Organization of African Unity and the relevant resolutions of those organizations, as well as in defiance of the principles of international law, to occupy by force the part of Chad territory commonly known as the "Aouzou Strip", which in fact represents the Tibesti sub-prefecture, that is, more than 150,000 square kilometres.

13. Indeed, Qaddafi's Libya attempted to occupy this part of Chad territory as far back as 1971. The occupation became effective in 1973.

14. In order to justify their actions the Libyan leaders refer on the one hand to a mere road map published in 1970 by *Studi Cartofici Milano* and which includes part of northern Chad as Libyan territory, with the explanatory note that the international borders thus outlined should not be considered as definitive, as they are subject to change and, on the other hand, to the stillborn Laval-Mussolini Treaty of 1935.

15. The stillborn Laval-Mussolini Treaty of 7 January 1935, termed the "Treaty of Rome on the settlement of the interests of Italy and France in Africa" [*S/15649, annex VII*], however it may upset the Libyan representative, is non-existent.

16. Although the French Parliament passed a law authorizing ratification of the Laval-Mussolini Treaty in fact there was no exchange of instruments of ratification. Therefore that Treaty never came into force and has never had any legal validity. Furthermore, on 17 December 1938, Count Ciano, the Italian Foreign Affairs Minister, declared: "As the Treaty of Rome was neither ratified nor completed, it is historically invalid".

17. On 23 December 1938, Mr. François Poncet, the French Ambassador to Italy, took note of that statement in the following terms:

> "If the instruments of ratification could not be exchanged owing to a postponement of the Tunisian Convention which was to precede that exchange, France is not responsible for appraisal of the circumstances which have led Italy itself to desire that postponement."

18. Moreover, in its resolution 392 (V) adopted on 15 December 1950, the United Nations General Assembly recommended, in paragraph 1 (*a*), with respect to Libya,

> "That the portion of its boundary with French territory not already delimited by international agreement be delimited, upon Libya's achievement of independence, by negotiation between the Libyan and French Governments, assisted on the request of either party by a third person to be selected by them or, failing their agreement, to be appointed by the Secretary-General".

19. It was on the basis of that resolution that the "Treaty of Friendship and Good Neighbourliness" was concluded on 10 August 1955, at Tripoli, between the French Republic and the United Kingdom of Libya [*ibid., annex X*].

20. Under the terms of article 3 of that Treaty, concerning the boundary, the following is clearly stated:

> "The two High Contracting Parties recognize that the frontiers between the territories of Tunisia, Algeria, French West Africa and French Equatorial Africa, on the one hand, and the territory of Libya, on the other hand, are those resulting from the international instruments in force on the date of the establishment of the United Kingdom of Libya, as defined in the exchange of letters appended hereto (annex I).

21. The aforementioned annex I, which constitutes the exchange of letters between the United Kingdom of Libya and the French Legation at Tripoli, clearly stipulates the following international instruments from which the western and southern borders of Libya result: first, the Franco-British Convention of 14 June 1898 [*ibid., annex I*], which delimits the French possessions of the Ivory Coast, the French Sudan and Dahomey, the British colonies of the Gold Coast, Lagos (Nigeria) and the other British possessions to the west of the Niger River, as well as the delimitation of the French and the British possessions and the spheres of influence of both countries to the east of the Niger River; secondly, the Additional Declaration of 21 March 1899 [*ibid., annex II*] delimiting the boundary between Chad and Libya; thirdly, the Franco-Italian Agreements of 1 November 1902 [*ibid., annex III*] reaffirming the preceding agreements; fourthly, the Convention between the French Republic and the Sublime Porte of 19 May 1910 [*ibid., annex IV*] delimiting the boundary between Tunisia and Tripolitania; fifthly, the Franco-British Convention of

8 September 1919 [*ibid., annex V*] delimiting the boundary between Chad and Libya; and sixthly, the Franco-Italian arrangement of 12 September 1919 [*ibid., annex VI*] delimiting the boundaries between Tripolitania, Algeria and Tunisia.

22. The Franco-Libyan Treaty was approved on 22 November 1956 by the French National Assembly and on 29 November by the Council of the Republic. Act No. 56-1235 of 12 December then authorized the President of the Republic to ratify it and the exchange of instruments of ratification took place on 20 February 1957. The Treaty was published and came into force through Decree No. 57-436 of 26 March, signed by the President of the French Republic, Mr. René Coty, and countersigned by the President of the Council of Ministers, Mr. Guy Mollet, and the Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Christian Pineau.

23. To our knowledge none of the parties expressed any reservations concerning the delimitation of the border between Chad and Libya. It should be made clear that the letters exchanged on the day of signature of the Treaty, on 10 August 1955, and which comprise annexes, are detailed and unassailable declarations as to the border between Chad and Libya. Thus the border between Chad and Libya is today constituted by the following two straight lines: the first originates at the Tummo well and ends at the intersection of the Tropic of Cancer 23° 27' north latitude with Greenwich 15° east longitude. The second originates at the Tropic of Cancer and goes to the point where Greenwich 24° east longitude meets parallel 19° 30' north latitude. It is at that point that the three borders of Chad, Libya and Sudan intersect.

24. As regards the question of borders, the Treaty of 10 August 1955 calls for the following comments.

25. The Treaty established, beyond any doubt, the lack of validity—indeed, the total non-existence of the Treaty of Rome of 7 January 1935. Article 3 and annex I in fact provide an exhaustive list of the international instruments in force concerning the borders. Since the Treaty of Rome is not on that list, it is clear that it never entered into force. This is a legal principle that cannot be called into question.

26. The Treaty recognizes the borders defined by the Franco-British Additional Declaration of 21 March 1899, the Barrère-Prinetti exchange of letters of 1 November 1902 and the Franco-British Convention of 8 September 1919.

27. Those international instruments concern not only Libya and Chad; they also concern other African States that are now independent.

28. Moreover, during discussions concerning ratification by France of the Treaty of 10 August 1955, on 29 November 1956, Mr. Maurice Faure, then Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs declared before the Council of the French Republic:

> "This Treaty provides for the definitive renunciation by Libya of the claims which, in the Mussolini era and by virtue of the agreements signed with Pierre Laval, Italy might have put forward to the Tibesti region".

It is therefore surprising, to say the least, that Libya should today invoke such a document to justify its occupation of part of the territory of Chad.

29. Furthermore, Libya unreservedly voted for resolution AHG/Res.16 (I) [*ibid., annex XII*] adopted at the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity (OAU), held at Cairo from 17 to 21 July 1964. By that resolution all member States pledged to respect borders existing at the time they attained independence.

30. Furthermore, in a treaty of friendship, co-operation and mutual assistance signed at N'Djamena—which was then Fort Lamy—on 12 January 1972, Chad and Libya undertook in their relations to respect the principles of the Charter of the Organization of African Unity and that of the United Nations. Therefore by occupying part of Chad's territory Libya is deliberately violating both the letter and the spirit of those Charters.

31. According to Article 2, paragraph 4, of the Charter of the United Nations:

> "All Members [of the Organization] shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Purposes of the United Nations."

Article III of the Charter of the Organization of African Unity stipulates that:

> "The member States, in pursuit of the purposes stated in Article II, solemnly affirm and delcare their adherence to the following principles: . . . respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of each State and for its inalienable right to independent existence".[1]

32. If today we have been compelled once again to address the Council it is because the aggression of which my country is the victim as a result of that occupation is becoming increasingly flagrant.

33. The statement we have just made to the Council amply demonstrates—if that were needed—the seriousness of the situation now prevailing in my country. As the Council knows, Chad is one of the countries least favoured by nature and its poverty is very familiar to the international community. We are now living through the grimmest hours of our history because of the expansionist designs of our neighbour to the north, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya.

34. This situation not only endangers the very existence of Chad as a sovereign State and as a member of the international community: it can also seriously endanger the peace and security of that part of the African continent.

35. That is why, inspired by our desire to resolve the problem through peaceful channels, Chad is today addressing the Council in order to obtain its assistance in recovering its territorial integrity so that it may live in peace within the borders it inherited from colonization. It is requesting that Libya withdraw completely from the territory of Chad.

36. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, upon whom I now call.

37. Mr. TREIKI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (*interpretation from Arabic*): At the outset, Sir, I wish to congratulate you on your assuming the presidency for this month. I am confident that your experience and wisdom will help the Council in its deliberations.

38. I cannot fail to seize this opportunity to congratulate your predecessor, Mr. Oleg Troyanovsky, the representative of the Soviet Union, and to convey to him the gratitude of my delegation for his valuable efforts and the wisdom with which he conducted the proceedings of this Council last month.

39. In the letter dated 17 March, which I addressed to you in the name of my country [*S/15645*], I stated that we did not see any reason for the convening of this meeting of the Council because the letter submitted by the delegation of the Northern Army, that of Hissein Habré [*S/15644*], has no formal character and is completely devoid of meaning. That letter represents a personal stance on the part of the leader of the Northern Army, the so-called FAN, and it is inimical to the Jamahiriya.

40. What is the situation in Chad; what does this delegation—if we can call it a delegation—represent? Who can speak in the name of Chad at the present time? Is it the legitimate Government of President Goukouni Weddey, the Government recognized by the OAU, a Government that represents all of the parties in Chad who were signatories to the Lagos Accord [*S/14378, annex I*], or is one of the wings of that Government, the wing led by the former Defence Minister, a clique that represents only one of the eleven groups that were signatories to the Lagos Accord?

41. Members of the Council must be made familiar with the issues in Chad and examine the explosive situation that prevails there as a result of the ambitions of the person who, as mentioned in the minutes of the Lagos meeting, which are still available, was willing to walk over the body of every person in Chad in order to accede to power.

42. The Jamahiriya has historic relations with Chad. Both countries fought together against Italian fascist colonialism; many Chadians died on Libyan soil and thousands of Libyans died while defending Chadian soil against imperialism. Both peoples are cohesive even at the racial level; Hissein Habré himself, the leader of the northern group, has two sisters who are married to Libyans.

43. Because of these factors, from the very outset and until the Libyan revolution, the Jamahiriya did its best to help the people of Chad achieve stability. Ever since the outbreak of the FROLINAT [*National Liberation Front of Chad*] revolution, which began at Nyala in the Sudan in 1966 under the leadership of the late Ibrahim Abatcha, we have attempted to effect a national reconciliation in Chad to protect that country's interests.

44. Beginning in 1974, we initiated serious attempts to achieve that end. After the *coup d'état* of General Malloum, I personally went to N'Djamena two weeks later at the request of President Malloum to try to effect a national reconciliation in Chad. Contacts were actually made with Mr. Abba Siddik, who was secretary general of FROLINAT at the time, and with Hissein Habré, the leader of the Armed Forces of the North. At the time, Goukouni Weddey was an assistant of Hissein Habré, and we sent a delegation to meet with him in Tibesti, together with the then President, Mr. El-Baghlani.

45. It must be remembered that Habré had been employed as a civil servant in the town of Al-Bayda, Libya, and that he had been asked to leave Libya because of malfeasance. He then went to Tibesti and raised an army against the N'Djamena Government.

46. Hissein Habré rejected the notion of national reconciliation, but Goukouni Weddey arrived in Tripoli and a meeting between the resistance groups in Chad was held there, at which it was agreed to work towards national reconciliation. Madame Françoise Claustre had been imprisoned in Tibesti by Habré, who wished to hold her hostage. Goukouni, however, prevented him from doing so, and Madame Claustre was later released to the French Government through Libya.

47. As the result of a Sudanese initiative, a quadripartite summit meeting was held by the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Chad, Niger and the Sudan on 22 February 1978, at which it was decided to move towards national reconciliation in Chad and to convene a meeting at Sebha in Libya in order to effect national reconciliation. National reconciliation was achieved, but Habré refused to participate in it as one of the groups parties to the Chad dispute. He went to the Sudan and there formed a movement. Meetings were held at Benghazi and Sebha, after which a communiqué was issued and agreement was reached between FROLINAT and the N'Djamena Government, with the participation of representatives of Niger and of the Sudan, whose delegation was led by the then First Vice-President of the Democratic Republic of the Sudan, Mr. Abu-Al-Qasem Mohammed Ibrahim. However, that agreement was also rejected by Hissein Habré. Later, Hissein Habré was reconciled with General Malloum and became Prime Minister of Chad. However, only a few weeks later he rebelled against President Malloum and the civil war in Chad assumed larger dimensions. At the initiative of Nigeria, the first Kano meeting was convened in Nigeria on 11 March 1979. Most of the Chadian groups attended that meeting, including Hissein Habré. He insisted on deposing President Malloum of Chad. I was a participant on behalf of

my country at that meeting. Habré formed a Government in defiance of the Kano Accord with Shawwa as Prime Minister. However, the OAU refused to recognize that Government.

48. The first Lagos meeting was then convened. However, Hissein Habré also refused to participate in that meeting. When he realized that the OAU was rejecting his position and refusing to recognize his Government, he agreed to participate in the second Lagos meeting, at which the following leaders from Chad took part: Goukouni Weddey, Wadal Abdelkadar Kamougué, Hissein Habré, Aboubakar Abdel Rahane, Acyl Ahmed, Abdoulaye Adam Dana, Abba Siddik, Hadjero Senoussi, Mahamat Abba Said and Fatcho Balam. At that meeting, the Lagos Accord was signed; Habré himself signed it, and in accordance with its provisions he became Minister of Defence in the national Government of Chad. Only a few months later, Minister of Defence Habré rebelled against the legitimate Government and civil war broke out anew in Chad. Two weeks prior to the outbreak of war, Habré had invited a Libyan delegation to discuss the situation in N'Djamena. I attended that meeting as a member of the Libyan delegation, and Hissein Habré, Minister of the Interior Abba Siddik, Wadal Abdelkadar Kamougué and Goukouni Weddey, head of the Government, were there as well. Hissein Habré asked for Libya's help. When I informed him that for Libya the question of Chad had been resolved by the Lagos Accord and the formation of the Government of National Unity, he stated: "This is a negative neutrality".

49. The minutes of that meeting are available, and all those who took part in it are alive today.

50. Hissein Habré insisted that the Jamahiriya should support Chad. With the intensification of the fighting and in accordance with resolution AHG/Res.101 (XVII) adopted at the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the OAU at its seventeenth session, held at Freetown from 1 to 4 July 1980 [*S/14378, annex II*], which called explicitly for assistance to the Government of National Unity in Chad, following a legitimate request from that Government and acting in accordance with signed agreements, Libya sent armed forces to assist that Government in putting an end to Habré's rebellion. The rebel Habré was beaten and fled to the Sudan. At that time, Chad enjoyed peace for the first time in 15 years. The civil war in Chad ended.

51. Afterwards, at its eighteenth session, held at Nairobi from 24 to 27 June 1981, the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the OAU adopted resolution AHG/Res.102 (XVIII)/Rev.1,[2] by which it unanimously decided to support the Government of National Unity headed by Goukouni Weddey, and to form a force made up of certain African States to help Chad end the war, establish peace and implement the Lagos Accord, which stipulated the holding of elections in Chad within six months and the formation of a constitutional Government.

52. After the arrival of the African forces, President Goukouni sent a request to the Jamahiriya to withdraw its forces, and orders were actually issued to withdraw the Libyan forces shortly thereafter. Then Hissein Habré resumed his rebellions activities and ravaged Chad anew with the help of imperialist forces that we all know, and which have incited him today, after their defeat in the Security Council in the past, to lodge a complaint against Libya.

53. Civil war broke out, but we were entirely neutral, as Hissein Habré is well aware. He sent us missions at that time; however we have never interfered: we actually withdrew our forces from eastern Chad much faster than in other areas so as not to give Hissein Habré an excuse to say that Libyan forces resisted him when he entered Chad.

54. President Goukouni contacted us, arrived in Libya and asked again that Libya forces be sent anew, but we categorically refused that request.

55. Then Hissein Habré entered N'Djamena to start a new era of bloodshed and massacre of the people of Chad. He personally took part in those massacres, and *Paris Match* has published accounts of them. We found children, some Libyan or of Libyan descent, slaughtered in the lake there at the hands of Habré.

56. Thus we see two Governments in Chad, one legitimately recognized by the OAU, that of National Unity in Chad.

57. The participants at the conference held at Tripoli from 5 to 8 August 1982, attended by 34 Heads of African States, stated in particular the following in respect of Chad:

> "We expressed our deep concern for the deteriorating situation in Chad and for renewal of civil strife since the voluntary departure of the Jamahiriya's forces—whose efforts and sacrifices had significantly contributed to the restoration of peace and security and to safeguarding the unity of that long-suffering sister country.
>
> "We confirm our support of the Lagos Accord concerning national reconciliation in Chad and condemn any faction to that Accord which may seize power in a way that would disturb the peace and security of the country."[3]

58. At the second meeting, also held at Tripoli, more than 32 African countries refused to recognize the Habré Government. They stressed their recognition of the Government of Goukouni Weddey until the OAU convenes in plenary and takes a decision on who should represent Chad.

59. Mr. Habré sent four representatives to Libya at that time, including Mr. Miskine himself, conveying letters that confirmed to Colonel Qaddafi that he is a great socialist, seeks conciliation, wants recognition from

Libya and is willing even to give up N'Djamena. But we told him that we could not at all recognize something that the OAU did not. We even rejected publicizing any of the letters sent by Hissein Habré.

60. Why was this particular time chosen by Habré, who twice had met with Sharon in the presence of one of his then assistants who participated later in the Government of National Unity? Is Habré the one who expresses the desire of the people of Chad?

61. Representatives have all received a copy of the letter from the legitimate Government in Chad—that of National Unity—a copy of which I too have received through the Security Council. That letter categorically rejects the claim of the delegation of Chad, that of N'Djamena or that of the Northern Army, to represent Chad. It is the legitimate Government recognized by the OAU which issued that letter.

62. My present statement is not in any way a reply to what has been said by Idriss Miskine, the representative of the Northern Army, because I do not recognize him as the Foreign Minister of Chad in accordance with the OAU resolution. This does not at all mean recognition of that Government by Libya—unless recognized by the OAU. I speak to familiarize the Council with our point of view on the issue of Chad.

63. The representative of Habré spoke of legal details. I do not intend to dwell on legal issues in detail—there are so many of them on which I could dwell if I wanted—because I do not believe that the Security Council, which is concerned with international peace and security, is interested in the conventions of 1936 and 1956. That of 1936 is null and void, because Hissein Habré does not want it; but that of 1956, which was rejected and was not ratified by the Libyan Parliament, is in effect. I shall not dwell on border disputes. I do not believe that it is the purpose of the Council to do so because if it does there are 18 African States which have border disputes, and I can enumerate them all. It is not for the Council to deal with that now.

64. Furthermore, let us suppose that there is a dispute between Chad and Libya over the delimitation of borders. The Jamahiriya is not against the idea of discussing this with any State. We had recourse to the International Court of Justice in the case of the dispute with Malta concerning the continental shelf, and the same thing applies to Tunis, and a ruling in this regard has been issued. In the past, when there was a real Government of Chad, we conducted negotiations with an official delegation from that country headed by Mr. Jimmy Mimari, the then Vice-President of the Republic of Chad. At that time I headed a delegation as the Foreign Minister of my country and presented charts, and the delegation of Chad presented some of its documents, and we decided on more contacts. But to say that Aouzou is a part of Chad is a falsification of the situation. There has never been any sovereignty by Chad over Aouzou throughout history—not during the royal era, not after the revolution, and not during the Italian or Ottoman periods.

65. Libya's borders during the Ottoman era were at the city of Faya, and the charts can testify to that. A chart annexed to the documents of Libya's independence which was incorporated in the report of Mr. Adrian Belt is deposited with the United Nations, and is available at the United Nations and its Library; it shows that Aouzou is an integral part of Libya.

66. We do not accept consideration of this issue. It has to do with sovereignty and it cannot be discussed by any party whatsoever. But we are ready to consider any dispute.

67. In the past, during the 1977 OAU meeting at Libreville, Mr. Kamougué, the Foreign Minister of Chad, who is Vice-President of the legitimate Government of Goukouni Weddey, submitted a complaint to the OAU. An *ad hoc* mediation committee[4] was formed for Chad and Libya and is still in existence. It is entrusted with the task of considering the dispute, if there is any, between Chad and Libya.

68. And at the 1978 OAU meeting at Khartoum the existence of the Committee was reconfirmed.[5] It does exist. In the OAU we have a conciliation and arbitration commission, and did the delegation of Chad at the time—not the representative of Habré who has no competence—contact it?

69. The representative of Habré is representing no one. He is an agent. Even his tickets and hotel expenses in New York were paid him in order to denigrate the Jamahiriya. But I can attest to the fact that ultimately he will do nothing but sabotage Chad's national interests. Chad needs national reconciliation. It needs the Lagos Accord anew for reconciliation. And when there is a legitimate government in Chad recognized by the OAU, my country affirms before you that it will be ready, as in the past, to consider with that government any dispute.

70. But this is a farce. I call it that because there is no current tension between Libya and Chad. The tension is in Chad itself; there are actually two Governments in Chad—a legitimate one that controls more than half of Chad, and that of Habré, propped up by foreign colonial help, which slaughters the people of N'Djamena. But Chad needs every penny for its reconstruction. For two full years we bore the brunt of Chad's expenses; we were its saviours, and the representative of Chad knows that even his salary and the expenses of the Mission of Chad here at that time were paid by Libya. We paid the arrears of Chad here in the United Nations so that Chad could participate in the voting; millions of dollars were spent also on the reconstruction of Chad.

71. The representative of Hissein Habré cannot come now and say that Libya occupied Chad in 1973—the Year of Fenugreek, according to a popular Libyan saying. In 1973 Mr. Habré was asleep in Al-Bayda, as I mentioned, after being expelled from Libya for malfeasance. Now he comes back calling for Aouzou. He is

obviously dreaming. Actually he has been asleep since 1972—quite a long time indeed—and now he has awakened and he claims that the situation in Chad is explosive, and that Libya is occupying Chadian territory. But Libya respects all international instruments. Libya signed the Cairo Agreement and has respected the colonial borders. We inherited borders from Italian colonialism, and Chad inherited borders from French colonialism. We respect the freedom and territorial integrity of Chad, but we reject the notion that there should be interference in our affairs; we reject any claim to part of our land.

72. The people in Aouzou are Libyans and have representatives in the Libyan General People's Congress. They will not accept to be anything but Libyans. This issue can never be the subject of discussion on the part of any party whatsoever. With due respect to all, we categorically reject any such discussion. However, we are willing to consider all issues with Chad when there is a national régime in Chad representing all the people of Chad, as I said before.

73. I believe that the Council's competence is clear in accordance with Article 33 of the Charter of the United Nations, which stipulates the following:

> "The parties to any dispute, the continuance of which is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security"

—if such a dispute exists; but even Habré's representative did not say that peace and security are being endangered at all: there is no dispute between Chad and Libya—

> "shall, first of all, seek a solution by negotiation, enquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, resort to regional agencies or arrangements, or other peaceful means of their own choice."

Article 33 is crystal-clear: there is nothing endangering peace and security at all. We are ready to begin immediate talks with the legitimate Government of President Goukouni, recognized by the OAU. We do not want to impose our will on anyone or on Chad. Libyan forces were in the whole of Chad and we would have been able to impose our will, but we had no desire to do that. When we were asked to withdraw our forces, we did so in 10 days only. We know who is behind this gang. Tomorrow we will see the headlines in the New York newspapers—these newspapers which ignored Libya's complaint against imperialism in the Security Council because they wanted to exploit that issue for other purposes. Tomorrow we will see an editorial headlined "Chad has a complaint against Libya".

74. There are those who incite those mercenaries—and I say "mercenaries" because they do not represent Chad at all. Miskine himself—and I know him personally—knows that they belong, together with Hissein Habré, to one clan in Chad, together with others of his ilk.

75. The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform members of the Council that I have just received a letter from the representative of Egypt in which he requests to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite that representative to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Khalil (Egypt) took the place reserved for him at the side of the Council chamber.

76. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Senegal. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

77. Mr. SARRÉ (Senegal) (*interpretation from French*): Permit me first of all, Sir, on behalf of my delegation and on my own behalf personally, to congratulate you most warmly on your assumption of the presidency for March. My delegation is convinced that, thanks to your qualities as a seasoned diplomat, the work of the Council will be successful.

78. This complaint by Chad against Libya is timely, and I believe that, were the United Kingdom not a member of the Council, everything would have had to be done for it to be here with us today—and indeed for several reasons. The first is that the case before the Council for consideration indirectly concerns the United Kingdom, and, because of the responsibilities of your country, Sir, the United Kingdom, you would have had to take cognizance of it. There is another reason. A few moments ago I was reading your illustrious poet, Shakespeare, who, talking of your island, said this:

> "This fortress built by Nature for herself . . .
>
> "This precious stone set in the silver sea . . .
>
> "Against the envy of less happier lands . . .".*

79. Hence the people of your country have always been jealous of their independence and integrity. So for all those reasons, Sir, I think you are in a better position than anyone else, with your characteristic objectivity, to be able to appreciate the problem we are considering today.

80. Having said that, permit me also to pay a well-deserved tribute to the outgoing President, Mr. Troyanovsky, representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, for the praiseworthy manner in which he guided the proceedings of the Council during February.

81. My delegation welcomes the new members to the Council—Malta, the Netherlands, Nicaragua, Pakistan

* Quoted in English by the speaker.

and Zimbabwe—and wishes them every success in the delicate and important work they are called upon to do in the Council.

82. I should like also to thank you, Sir, and the other members of the Council for the honour you have done me in having invited the Senegalese delegation to participate in the debate on the dispute between two fraternal African countries—Chad and Libya. You have given my delegation an opportunity to make its own modest contribution to the discussion of this important item on the agenda, a matter which, it must be said, is of great concern to all Africans. Whether we like it or not, if it is not settled it will pose a threat to international peace and security.

83. It is with the greatest interest and attention that my delegation listened to the parties—the Republic of Chad, through its representative, Mr. Idriss Miskine, Minister for Foreign Affairs and Co-operation, and the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, in the person of its representative to the United Nations, Mr. Ali Treiki—with regard to a strip of territory on the frontier between the two countries commonly known as the Aouzou Strip.

84. The argument of Chad, which was so brilliantly presented to us by Mr. Miskine, as we heard him just now, proceeded along strictly Cartesian lines, which, based on a number of irrefutable historic and juridical facts, followed implacable rigor and logic. We are particularly grateful to the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Chad for this new light he has shed on the dispute between his country and Libya—light which gives us a better appreciation of the problem of the occupation of the Aouzou Strip in Tibesti. We believe that this presentation will have been illuminating to the Council and to all those listening to this debate as to the true dimensions and the true nature of the problem.

85. The purpose of my delegation is not to dispense justice and still less to enforce it. Our own purpose is to be objective, so that our contribution to the debate can shed further light on the matter for the Council to enable it to take informed decisions, as it deems appropriate, in possession, in so far as possible, of all the elements of the case.

86. As is known, Senegal was a member of the *Ad Hoc* Mediation Committee set up in July 1977 at the fourteenth session of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the OAU, held at Libreville,[4] on the initiative of Mr. Omar Bongo, President of the Gabonese Republic and at the time President of the OAU, in order to seek ways and means to bring about a peaceful solution—a solution, I would say, essentially African in its nature—to the problem which today is the subject of the proceedings in the Council.

87. Senegal has therefore followed this question very closely because of its unequivocal devotion to the ideals of peace and justice, as enshrined in the Charter of the Organization of African Unity and in the Charter of the United Nations, and to scrupulous respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of States.

88. From the study of the case my delegation has had the opportunity to make, it becomes clear, if one refers to the historic facts and the juridical documents left by the former colonial Powers, whether they be, among others, Franco-British Conventions—and that was why, Sir, I referred a moment ago to the fact that it was most fortunate that you were President of the Council right now—the 8 September 1919 Convention [*S/15649, annex V*], the Franco-Italian arrangement of 12 September 1919 [*ibid., annex VI*], the Laval-Mussolini Treaty of 7 January 1935 [*ibid., annex VII*], upon which, incidentally, the Libyan side is basing itself, and, closer to us, the Treaty of Friendship and Good Neighbourliness signed on 10 August 1955 [*ibid., annex X*] between the French Republic and, at the time, the United Kingdom of Libya, it becomes clear, as I said, that Chad has legitimate reasons to claim sovereignty over the Aouzou Strip.

89. This part of Chad territory which today is the subject of competing claims was at the time of the signing at Tripoli itself on 2 March 1966 of the Agreement of Good-Neighbourliness and Friendship between Chad and Libya under Chad's administration, as indeed it was under French administration in the colonial era.

90. Unfortunately, we must note that this Agreement of Good-Neighbourliness and Friendship, as well as the Treaty of Friendship, Co-operation and Mutual Assistance signed on 23 December 1972, was violated by the Libyan side, as we have just been told by the delegation of Chad.

91. Indeed, the fact alone of unilaterally sending troops to Tibesti constitutes in itself a systematic violation of the principles of international law, inasmuch as this act violates the principles of territorial integrity and sovereignty of States as they appear in Article 2, paragraph 4, of the Charter of the United Nations and the sacrosanct principle of the inviolability of the frontiers inherited from the colonial era, as laid down in resolution AHG/Res.16 (I) of the OAU [*ibid., annex XII*], adopted at Cairo on 21 July 1964 as a supplement to article III, paragraph 3, of the Charter of the Organization of African Unity and which provides "respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of every State and for its inalienable right to an independent existence".

92. This resolution provides "that all member States pledge themselves to respect the borders existing on their achievement of national independence".

93. It seems to us therefore that the facts are now out in the open with all the clarity conferred upon them by historical truth and one could say that the case has been presented. It is now up to the Council, in the light of the debate, to take the necessary decisions.

94. For our part, we have listened to the case made by the Libyan side. Its argumentation—I regret to have to

say this—has hardly fully convinced us. We cannot, therefore, accept it in its entirety.

95. Without indulging in demagoguery—and without taking any side whatsoever or attempting to influence in any way the final decision of the Council—it does seem to us that the most appropriate solution would be to prevail upon our Libyan brothers and friends to heed the voice of reason.

96. The international community, through the Council, should act so as to get Libya to abide by the most elementary norms of international morality, the principles of international law and the rules of good-neighbourliness that underpin the Charter of the Organization of African Unity and the Charter of the United Nations itself, of which Libya is a member.

97. Libya must agree to respect the sovereignty of Chad and, more generally speaking, the sovereignty of other States. The use of force and illegal occupation have never been a good solution to disputes between States.

98. At a time when Africa needs to mobilize all its resources to face up to the numerous problems posed by its economic development, it seems hardly appropriate to us for it to allow itself to be dominated by dissension that is more likely to hold up its positive development towards the progress and well-being of its peoples.

99. Chad, which has gone through the ordeal of an unprecedented civil war and which has now regained its national unity, is attempting to rebuild from the rubble a sorely tried administration and economy. In this regard it is only natural for it to aspire to regain its territorial integrity and finally to live in peace within the frontiers it inherited from the colonial era. This is the truth.

100. In our view, the Government and the people of Chad deserve assistance. The International Conference on Assistance to Chad, organized under the auspices of the OAU and the United Nations and held at Geneva in November 1982, testifies to the clear will of the international community to come to the aid of the people of Chad, resolutely committed to the battle for development.

101. It is in this spirit of solidarity and equity that we should like to see the case of Chad considered, hoping, as the President of the Republic of Senegal, Mr. Abdou Diouf, said in an interview which he granted two weeks ago to the Third World Press Club of Radio France International, "that Libya will respect the sovereignty of Chad and of other States and will truly attempt to work for the unity of the countries of Africa".

102. It is this appeal that I should like to repeat here to our Libyan brothers, that they may heed the voice of reason and withdraw from Chadian territory so that the people of Chad, who have been so sorely tried, can recover their unity and independence, make their contribution to African unity, as well as their modest contribution to the establishment of a new era of civilization, peace, justice and fraternity.

103. Mr. AMEGA (Togo) (*interpretation from French*): I should first like to present to you, Sir, the warm congratulations of my delegation on your assumption of the presidency. Your competence and your great experience in international relations assure us of good leadership in the Council's business for this month.

104. I take this opportunity to convey to your predecessor, Mr. Troyanovsky, the representative of the Soviet Union, the congratulations and thanks of my delegation for the excellent work he accomplished last month when President of the Council.

105. I should also like to welcome to our midst Mr. Idriss Miskine, the Minister for Foreign Affairs and Co-operation of Chad, who was kind enough to undertake the journey to New York to participate in the Council's work. The fact that he is with us is in itself extremely meaningful and conveys the full importance of the matter before the Council.

106. The matter which the Council now has before it concerns two countries: the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and Chad, members of the OAU and of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, two countries that are friends of Togo and with which the Togolese Government maintains excellent relations of friendship and co-operation.

107. Togo has always acknowledged the right of all peoples to adopt the government of their choice. This is a sovereign right. Togo recognizes States, not individuals. That is why our Government recognized the Government of National Unity of Chad, presided over by Goukouni Weddey, when it enjoyed the support of 11 factions and of the people of Chad.

108. In the same way, since 7 June 1982 Togo has recognized the Government of Hissein Habré, which enjoys the support of the people of Chad and the international community. The United Nations and the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries have both solemnly recognized the Government of Hissein Habré, as the sole legitimate Government of Chad.

109. The Government of Togo is, furthermore, most gratified at the very fortunate initiative recently taken by the Libyan authorities, who dispatched to Mr. Hissein Habré an official mission in order together to seek ways and means of producing an amicable settlement to the dispute between those two countries, which is the subject of our present discussion in the Council.

110. Togo is therefore convinced that the territorial dispute existing between the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and the Republic of Chad can still be settled through bilateral negotiations, with or without the mediation of third parties.

111. Consequently Togo advocates that all means, including arbitration and international judgement, be used to bring about a peaceful outcome of this dispute.

112. Togo is prepared to support any resolution that may be adopted by the Security Council in order to resolve the dispute.

113. Mr. SALAH (Jordan) (*interpretation from Arabic*): Mr. President, allow me at the outset to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency for this month. Your well known experience, competence and capability will enable you to conduct the work of the Council with great success. Your diplomatic skill and expertise will enable the Council to achieve the best possible results. It gives me pleasure to commend the traditional friendship binding our two countries and the closeness of our relations.

114. I cannot fail to congratulate Mr. Troyanovsky, the representative of the Soviet Union, on the way in which he conducted the work of the Council last month. His skill, expertise and objectivity won him admiration and appreciation.

115. The delegation of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan views the issue before the Council in the light of the following considerations.

116. First, the great continent of Africa has been suffering from many complicated problems. The peoples of that fraternal continent are chafing under the problems of development, problems for which colonialism was responsible, and its peoples are trying to confront and overcome them by various means. To that end all efforts and potentialities must be harnessed to ensure an appropriate atmosphere of co-operation and stability among the States of that continent and between that continent and the world.

117. Secondly, African border disputes are vestiges of colonialism, and in that continent they assume a distinct and special character. But it is encouraging to see that many African States have overcome those disputes and achieved amicable settlement of them in a manner acceptable to all parties. Those settlements were facilitated by the adoption of a rational and realistic approach and the exercise of quiet diplomacy through bilateral contacts between States. Moreover, regional organizations, good offices and arbitration proceedings by those organizations played a vital role in bridging the differences on many issues that arose among African brothers, including border disputes. But the most common element in the achievement of amicable settlements of border disputes in Africa and elsewhere was that all parties were keen not to intensify and escalate those disputes and not to use them regionally or internationally as instruments in the context of regional and international political disputes. Making those disputes subject to the social and political contradictions that plague African relations and politicizing and internationalizing them causes complications, bringing more transient issues to the forefront while basic issues are drowned in a tumult of charges and counter-charges. Issues that at the outset are amenable to solution become intractable because they become symbols for issues that cannot be solved without resort to force in relations among nations.

118. We must warn against raising normal issues amenable to solution in a charged atmosphere and in a context that is far from friendly. We emphasize the gravity of using these disputes in the context of strategic and political conflicts between States. We do so because we are careful to preserve the interests of all parties, who in this instance are our brothers in national identity and creed to whom we are bound by ties of common destiny in the context of the League of Arab States and the Organization of the Islamic Conference. We are also bound to them by amicable and fraternal relations, and we should like to see stability prevail in their countries and an atmosphere of understanding and co-operation prevail in their bilateral relations.

119. The declaration made by the representative of Libya concerning its readiness to discuss the border dispute between it and its neighbour Chad on a bilateral level and in the Organization of African Unity is compatible with the principles of the Charter and exemplifies a responsible political position. We hope that such discussion will take place, when circumstances permit, as a result of Chad's positive response to this Libyan commitment.

120. In this context we call upon our brothers in Libya and Chad to pursue a policy of restraint, good-neighbourliness and peaceful settlement of disputes. We would assure them that it is in the interests of the peace and stability of both countries and of the whole region not to link border disputes to issues of legitimacy in each country because we believe that the nature of the régime of any country falls squarely within the competence of the people of that country and that selection of that régime is its exclusive right.

121. Finally, this reality prompts us to call upon our brothers in Libya and Chad to return to bilateral contacts to settle this dispute among brothers and to give the OAU a real opportunity to continue its activities in this regard.

122. The OAU has given the Chad question special attention and has adopted numerous unanimous decisions regarding it. It has also constituted a five-member good-offices committee which is still concerned with the achievement of an amicable settlement of the Libya-Chad border dispute.

123. Hence we think it would be wise if the efforts expended by the OAU enjoyed the support of Libya and Chad, which participated in the constitution of that organization and have already accepted its good offices, and the support of the Council, since these efforts accord with Article 52 of the Charter of the United Nations. The last thing Africa needs is conflicts or tension.

124. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of the Ivory Coast. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

125. Mr. ESSY (Ivory Coast) (*interpretation from French*): I should like to thank you, Mr. President,

for affording my delegation this opportunity to speak on a problem that concerns it not only as an African State but also as a peace-loving State that wishes to see international relations governed by ethical principles and by certain norms which are indispensable for the attainment of a coherent international society committed to a system of law and in which those subject to international law, both large and small, can enjoy the attributes of their sovereignty without fear.

126. The United Kingdom, which had the formidable responsibility of presiding at the attainment of international sovereignty by many large and small States, all Members of the United Nations, is in a better position than anyone to realize how fragile certain sovereignties would be were there no body of law capable of protecting them against the expansionist greed and designs of certain Powers. It is therefore a real pleasure for my delegation to see the representative of the United Kingdom, a country with which the Ivory Coast has relations of sincere friendship and multilateral co-operation, occupying the presidency of the Council.

127. Your extensive diplomatic experience and your skills which we have admired both in the Council and in the General Assembly, are a valuable contribution to our search for a peaceful solution to the thorny question now before the Council.

128. I should also like to express our gratitude to your predecessor, Mr. Troyanovsky, for the usual effectiveness and skill with which he guided the work of the Council last month.

129. For the Ivory Coast peace is a true creed without which there can be no development. Thus it cannot remain indifferent to any threat to or breach of the peace in any African State, particularly in those areas that President Houphouet-Boigny defined in April 1971 in an effort to find ways and means to guarantee peace to our continent; he identified three prerequisites that are closely interrelated: namely, peace within each African State, peace among African States and peace between the African States and the rest of the world.

130. Accordingly, it is obvious that if any one of those three prerequisites were lacking the entire system would be threatened. In the case before the Council today, what do we find? First, Chad, an African country, has not experienced calm political life since 1965, that is, five years after its accession to independence—that calm political life conducive to the development essential for a country that is relatively disadvantaged by being landlocked. Secondly, there is a border dispute between Chad and its neighbour to the north, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya. Those two situations, both of which run counter to the three prerequisites I mentioned earlier, cannot fail to be of concern to any African State that seeks peace for the African continent and, therefore, peace for itself.

131. However, above and beyond this dispute between two African States, with all the consequences it entails, there are tenets of our policy which we cannot allow to be challenged. Foremost is respect for the Charter of the Organization of African Unity, which is consistent with the Charter of the United Nations, one of the cardinal principles of which is non-interference in the internal affairs of States.

132. The OAU recognizes States and not individuals. The Tobar and Wilson doctrines on the theory of legitimacy are alien to Africa. "The first to become king," history teaches us, "was a successful soldier". Just as we recognized Goukouni Weddey as Head of State of Chad when he was in power in N'Djamena, so too we today fully recognize Mr. Hissein Habré as Head of Government of Chad. The Ivory Coast, as President Houphouet-Boigny has stated on many occasions, "does not pass judgement on *coups d'état*. The only judges are the sovereign peoples who experience such changes of régime or administration."

133. It is all the more difficult for us to understand the criticism and objections that have been raised, particularly when they emanate from persons who have employed similar methods in acceding to high office.

134. The welcome accorded the present delegation of Chad, both in meetings within the United Nations system and by the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, is highly significant in this connection as indicating the desire of the international community to see a certain stability prevail in international relations.

135. There is another principle that is dear to us in the OAU, and that was designed by our Heads of State precisely in order to avoid the border conflicts that could not fail to arise in the decolonization of territories interrelated by geography and history.

136. That principle of the inviolability of the borders that emerged as an aftermath of decolonization is enshrined in resolution AHG/Res.16 (I) [*ibid.*] adopted on 21 July 1964 at the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the OAU, held at Cairo, which stipulates in paragraph 2 "that all member States pledge themselves to respect the borders existing on their achievement of national independence", and made it possible for our States in the sub-region, within the framework of joint commissions, to delimit our borders with the help of the maps, agreements and treaties bequeathed by the former colonizing Powers.

137. All States that emerged from decolonization possess geographical and population-related data that cannot be in error since the taxation system enforced in the colonial period enabled the colonial administration in place to draw up a balanced budget for the management of the territory under its administration. It was therefore not in the interests of the colonial Powers to manipulate those geographical and population-related data because of the impact of such data on the budget of the colony and, therefore, on that of the home country in case of deficit.

138. In the case before us today there have been numerous international instruments concluded between the former colonizing Powers of Chad and Libya, among

which we might mention the Franco-British Convention of 14 June 1898, the Additional Declaration on 21 March 1899, which is an addendum to that Convention, the Franco-Italian Agreements of 1 November 1902 and the Treaty of Friendship and Good Neighbourliness concluded between the French Republic and the United Kingdom of Libya on 10 August 1955 [*S/15649, annexes I, II, III and X, respectively*].

139. From our reading of the letters addressed to the President of the Security Council by the representatives of the Republic of Chad, as well as the letter from the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, we can affirm that there does undeniably exist, under the terms of Article 33 of the Charter of the United Nations, a dispute whose prolongation is likely to threaten the maintenance of peace in Africa and, therefore, international security.

140. One party bases itself upon a plethora of legal texts in proving its good faith with regard to legal title inherited in a "succession of States", whereas the other party calls these into question.

141. The Council therefore cannot stand idle in the face of this dispute and adjourn without recommending the use of one of the means for peaceful settlement provided by the Charter: *inter alia*, possible recourse to the International Court of Justice to obtain its legal opinion in this succession of States which concerns two African States members of the OAU and Members of the United Nations and therefore governed by the cardinal principles of those two organizations, which are based on respect for territorial integrity, non-interference in the internal affairs of States, non-aggression and the non-acquisition of territories by force and respect for the independence and sovereignty of States.

142. The Ivory Coast will spare no effort to make its modest contribution to any peaceful solution to this dispute that is based on justice and law.

143. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Sudan. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

144. Mr. ABDALLA (Sudan) (*interpretation from Arabic*): It gives me great pleasure and is an honour for me to convey to you, Sir, at the outset of my statement warmest congratulations on your assumption of the presidency for the current month. We are confident that your wide experience and expertise in the diplomatic and political fields will be great assets and enable the Council to discharge its duties and responsibilities in the service of international peace and security in a way that will respond to the desires and expectations of the international community for security and stability. My country, which enjoys close relations with your friendly country, wishes to confirm its co-operation with you in the achievement of our noble purposes.

145. My thanks go also to your predecessor, Mr. Oleg Troyanovsky, the representative of the Soviet Union, for his meritorious efforts and great activities that characterized his presidency of the Council last month.

146. The Council has been convened to consider an important issue represented by the complaint submitted by the Government of Chad against the Libyan occupation of a part of its territory.

147. A few weeks ago we had an opportunity to address this Council on a matter in which Libya—most unfortunately—was the main common denominator. At that time we confirmed that the quest of the Jamahiriya for domination and expansion and its threat to the security of neighbouring and other countries were the main reasons for the tension and state of instability prevailing in that region.

148. A real source of concern is to see the Council for the second time in less than a month open the file of Libyan intervention in the affairs of neighbouring countries, subjecting their independence and sovereignty to danger at a time when the ink has barely dried on the statements made in the last series of meetings concerning the importance of respecting the territorial integrity of other States and the principles of non-interference in their internal affairs and the inadmissibility of the use or threat of use of force.

149. What is unfortunate, too, is that neighbouring countries constitute an arena for these aggressive acts by Libya at a time when Libya's responsibility should be keenly to develop good-neighbourly relations, mutual respect and co-operation with its neighbours, as well as to strengthen the historical and cultural bonds that link it with those States.

150. As it participates in the present debate of the Council on the issue of the Libyan presence in Chad, my country confirms Sudan's interest in this matter. A continuation of this presence which has lasted for a decade has negative effects on Sudan and the other African States and threatens their security and stability. In addition, our interest stems from the fact that the essence of the issue proceeds from the aforementioned principles: respect for the sovereignty and independence of the neighbouring States and their territorial integrity, the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force, and the importance of the peaceful resolution of disputes. Above all, the perpetuation of that presence obstructs efforts aimed at establishing peace and security in that country. Also, it endangers Chad, which is one of the least developed countries, prevents it from achieving economic and social development for its people and, moreover, obstructs the efforts of the international community to help Chad—efforts that were crystallized during the International Conference on Assistance to Chad held recently at Geneva.

151. I do not need—especially after the clear statement made by the Minister for Foreign Affairs and Co-operation of Chad—to dwell on the political and legal aspects of the Libyan-Chadian dispute which would reinforce Chad's sovereignty over the Aouzou sector. My

delegation wishes to draw the Council's attention to the danger of the continuation of the Libyan presence in Chad, a crystal-clear issue that should not be the subject of prevarication or speculation. It is a matter that has to do with the illegal occupation of a part of Chad's territory and represents a violation of the principles of the regional organization to which the two parties to this dispute belong. I refer to the OAU, which has confirmed the inviolability of frontiers inherited at the time of independence.

152. This issue represents another dimension of Libya's relationship with its neighbours and other African countries resulting from a policy characterized by intervention in the affairs of others, attempts at destabilizing those countries, imposing a trusteeship and hegemony, using mercenaries and threats of military invasion. This is clear from Libya's occupation of a country, its sowing seeds of discord among its people, allying itself with those who have done the same with it, and expelling by force of arms those who did not ally themselves, thus undermining OAU principles and other international norms that govern contemporary conduct among nations. It has also obstructed the OAU plan aimed at achieving reconciliation in Chad.

153. This period is characterized by a deterioration in Libya's position, and about one third of the members of the OAU have severed relations with Libya owing to its acts.

154. Libya did not confine itself to this occupation, but continued to be inimical to the present Government in Chad, which represented the hopes of the people of Chad for national unity and reconstruction. It was inimical to it, threatening it and doubting its representation of the people of Chad, starting with Tripoli, continuing to Managua and ending in New Delhi during the meetings of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, oblivious to the fact that the Libyan presence in Chad is a national issue, that is, of interest to all the people of Chad, and is not a matter for futile verbal clashes about the legitimacy or illegitimacy of Governments.

155. The Council is confident that the dispute over the legitimacy of Governments can never be a justification or a reason for occupying the lands of others by force. The issue under consideration before the Council has to do with respect for two principles that are enshrined among the most important bases for international conduct. They are enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations, in the Charter of the Organization of African Unity and in other agreements relevant to the Chad issue that had been referred to by other speakers who preceded me this evening. These two principles are: respect for the territorial integrity of States and non-interference in the internal affairs of other countries. Respect for these two principles is not subject to certain Governments and there can never be any justification for violating them or for seeking other solutions based on disagreement among Governments.

156. Libya has declared that these issues should be resolved through regional arrangements in the OAU's Commission for Reconciliation and Arbitration, but what is unfortunate is that Libya has twice in succession obstructed the convening of OAU meetings at Tripoli, thus undermining the course of its different bodies, including that on reconciliation.

157. Libya must respect the principles of the OAU if it seriously wishes to resolve its disputes through the Charter of the Organization of African Unity. One of the most important principles is undoubtedly that of the inviolability of the frontiers inherited since independence—through which it was possible to avoid much of the plague of disputes at a time when the African States were still suffering from the problems of national unification and other problems, especially countries sharing common tribes and cultural and historical ties.

158. The issue of the Libyan presence in Chad is not an issue of today only. Certain Governments of Chad and countries like Sudan have sought a solution of the issue through the OAU throughout the years, but to no avail.

159. Chad's request that the Council consider this issue reflected the gravity of the matter as well as the continued inimical attitude of Libya towards the Government at N'Djamena. The Council, which is charged with the responsibility of maintaining international peace and security, must fulfil that obligation by taking the proper necessary measures to safeguard the independence and sovereignty of the Republic of Chad by calling upon Libya to withdraw its forces from Chad.

160. My country attaches great importance to the efforts of the present Government of Chad to restore its sovereignty throughout the entirety of its territory and commends that Government's efforts to submit this problem to the Council after the failure of successive Governments to solve it through other efforts, including regional mediation. We feel that the Council's position will reinforce the efforts of the people of Chad to maintain their country's independence and to reconstruct it after the civil wars that obstructed the clarification of all aspects of this issue. Chad has to direct all its resources and capabilities towards reconstruction and development in order to put an end to the vestiges of its past. This can be done only after the immediate and complete withdrawal of Libyan forces from the territory of Chad. This is what we hope for and we hope also that the deliberations of the Council will result in that coming about.

161. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Egypt. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

162. Mr. KHALIL (Egypt): I should first of all like to express my sincere congratulations to you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency. We wish you success and are equally sure that you will easily achieve it with distinction.

163. I should also like to avail myself of this opportunity to express to your predecessor, Mr. Troyanovsky of the Soviet Union, our gratitude for the manner in which he discharged his responsibilities.

164. Respect for the territorial integrity of Chad is not only a natural right of its people to sovereign independence, but is also necessary for peace, security and stability in the region, indeed in the African continent as a whole.

165. Constructive African efforts within the OAU have been diligently directed towards assisting the people of Chad to achieve peace and national unity after the civil strife that has, unhappily, engulfed them for over a decade. Heads of State of the OAU have consistently called upon all its members to support efforts aimed at maintaining peace and security in Chad, to abstain from interfering in its domestic affairs and to contribute towards creating the proper atmosphere necessary for consolidating stability and Chad's newly found peace, gained at such great cost, as we all know.

166. In spite of these clear, consistent and constructive positions and all the principles upon which they are based, a region which constitutes an integral part of Chad is still under occupation by the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya. Recurrent endeavours by the legitimate Government of Chad to induce Libya to withdraw from the territory of Chad have met, at best, with procrastination.

167. We have, I am sure, all listened with great care to the statement of the Minister for Foreign Affairs and Co-operation of Chad. Our attention was no less intense when we followed the arguments of the Permanent Representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya. In the opinion of my delegation, the Government of Chad was fully justified in bringing its complaint to the attention of the Council.

168. We did not detect in the statement of the Libyan representative any attempt seriously to resolve this issue, in spite of the very forthcoming position of the Government of Chad, as expressed by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Chad.

169. Foreign Minister Miskine, having thoroughly and, in my delegation's view, very convincingly presented his country's point of view, has again—and before the Council—repeated his Government's readiness to resolve this question by peaceful means. He has addressed himself to the Council in order for it to help the legitimate Government of Chad to restore its territorial integrity and to live in peace within the frontiers inherited from the past—a basic principle which the members of the OAU have pledged themselves to respect in order to avoid interminable difficulties and conflicts.

170. In the opinion of the delegation of Egypt, the least the Council could do is to call on Libya to respect the territorial integrity of Chad and, consequently, put an end to its occupation of Chadian territory, and to respond to Chad's attempt to put an end to, and resolve, the tension persisting between the two countries.

171. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Chad has asked to speak in exercise of the right of reply, and I now call on him.

172. Mr. BARMA (Chad) (*interpretation from French*): As members of the Council may have noticed when listening to the representative of Libya, he deliberately departed from the subject before us, that is, the occupation by force of part of Chad's territory by Libya. In so doing, the representative of Libya has amply demonstrated, as if there were a need to do so, that his country is flagrantly and shamelessly intervening in the internal affairs of Chad in overt violation of all international rules.

173. We therefore categorically refuse to be led down this path ourselves. Hence, in exercise of the right of reply, we would not like, as the representative of Libya did, to get bogged down in political considerations and thus miss the point about the precise problem we have brought to the Council—the question of the occupation of part of Chad's territory by Libya. Members of the Council will recall that in our statement we confined ourselves strictly to the legal aspect of this matter. Hence we had felt that the Libyan representative would do the same. Unfortunately, as Libya has always done, particularly in the Council on 7 February 1978 [*2060th meeting*], its representative has indulged in discussions and wild imaginings to evade the substance of the problem. All that the representative of Libya said was a tissue of lies and constituted unacceptable interference in the internal affairs of Chad.

174. Libya affirms without any proof to back it up that part of Chad's territory it is occupying by force is "an integral part of Libyan territory"—and those are terms used in the letter dated 17 March 1983 from the Libyan representative to the President of the Council [*S/15645*].

175. For our part we have presented irrefutable proof amply demonstrating that the territory at present occupied by Libya is unquestionably part of Chad. On 10 August 1955, in accordance with the recommendation of the General Assembly, a treaty was concluded between France and Libya [*S/15649, annex X*], putting an end to any Libyan claims to part of Chad's territory. And even in 1965—five years after Chad acceded to independence and 10 years after the signing of the French-Libyan Treaty—Chad and France were by common accord still administering that part of our territory at present occupied by Libya.

176. The representative of Libya has described us as "rebels". Can he say, therefore, why an official delegation of the Libyan Government went to N'Djamena on 2 March 1983 to discuss State matters with the Chad Government? I think this is, to say the least, a rather inconsistent attitude in the Libyan position. Can he tell us why his Government invited and welcomed to Tripoli, his capital, a governmental representative from Chad to discuss matters of State with Libyan authorities?

177. May I be allowed to reveal the content of the discussions which took place at N'Djamena and Tripoli, the essential subject of which, as my Government saw it, was the occupation by Libya of part of Chad's territory. Let this be well understood: for the Libyans, three conditions

must be met by Chad for these discussions to be successful. Firstly, our Government must proclaim an Arab Islamic Republic, whereas everyone knows that Chad is a republic—one, indivisible and non-religious—even though Chad was one of the founding members of the Organization of the Islamic Conference. Secondly, Libya demands that our country form a strategic alliance with Libya in order to destabilize the countries near Chad—Cameroon, the Niger and Nigeria—which it describes as reactionary régimes. Chad would then serve as a springboard to destabilize the régimes of these neighbouring countries. Thirdly, Libya asks us to keep the historic frontiers between the two countries, which, as they see it, means that the present frontier between the two countries would have to be obliterated.

178. Once these three conditions had been met, Libya would then hand over to the Chad Government the members of this puppet government.

179. As the Council can well imagine, our Government rejected *in toto* these three unacceptable conditions and the shameless bargain proposed by Libya. In view of this extremely negative position taken by Libya, like that adopted at previous negotiations both bilaterally and in the OAU, the Chad Government decided to bring the matter before the Council so that the true problem of the occupation of part of our territory should be settled by the Council, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and the Charter of the Organization of African Unity.

180. Hence we urge all the members of the Council to invite the representative of Libya, who is present here, to return to the question of concern to us which is now before the Council, namely, the occupation of part of our territory by Libya. All the delaying tactics of Libya prove to what extent the representative of Libya is lacking in arguments to justify the military presence of his country on Chad soil.

181. In conclusion, we once again request the representative of Libya to tell us under which claim and in the name of what convention or treaty Libya occupies part of Chad territory with impunity. It should withdraw its troops from Chad without any preconditions, for, contrary to what was said by the representative of Libya, there is indeed a threat to peace and security not only in the region but also internationally.

182. The CHAIRMAN: The representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya has asked to speak in exercise of the right of reply. I call on him.

183. Mr. TREIKI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The representative of Chad personally knows that what I said is true. He knows that before Idriss Miskine came to the United Nations he came to my office and said that he had not received a letter from the legitimate Government, that he was in an embarrassing situation and he sought my assistance at the time to help him to contact the legitimate Government.

184. I do not want to respond to Habré's delegation. I only want to respond to the delegation of one of the parties to Camp David—the delegation of Egypt—and to the delegation of Sudan.

185. Sudan and Egypt have common frontiers with Libya; yet they have not charged in their statements that Libya occupied part of Sudan or part of Egypt. Nemeiri's representative stated that Libya creates problems and is expanding. We have heard this from President Nemeiri personally, in Nairobi, and he even mentioned that Libya wanted to occupy Nigeria at that time. More pettiness!

186. I steered away from legal arguments; I stated clearly that at Tripoli and at N'Djamena—I was the head of my country's delegation—we spoke clearly of the legal question concerning the frontier problem that Chad claims exists with Libya and we are prepared to discuss this and any issue with the legitimate Government of Chad.

187. The representative of Sudan stated that Libya wanted to commit sabotage and rejects any legitimate Government—what legitimate Government or representative? Sudan is a signatory of the Lagos Accord [*S/14378, annex I*] and here is its signature—that of the Minister of State for Cabinet Affairs at that time. That Accord provides for the formation of a Government of National Unity in Chad comprising 11 groups. One of those groups is the delegation of Hissein Habré—the Armed Forces of the North.

188. Sudan presided over the Sebha meeting in Libya and was one of signatory States of the Sebha Declaration. The Sudanese delegation was led by Abu-Al-Qasem Mohammed Ibrahim, but Sudan disregarded its signature and concluded another agreement with Hissein Habré whereby Hissein Habré was later appointed Prime Minister under President Malloum.

189. Sudan also incited Habré to rebel at that time, as it incited him in the last rebellion against President Goukouni. Who incited whom to rebellion in Chad?

190. We now hear that Libya sent a delegation. That is not true; Libya did not send an official delegation. We hear that Libya wants an Islamic republic in Chad! We could have done that when we had our forces in Chad, had we wanted to. What would have stopped us? I do not think President Nemeiri would have stopped us; he could not even defend his capital against internal opposition elements. I do not think that one of the parties to Camp David, who sold the land to colonialism to establish its bases, would have stopped us. But Libya refuses to do this. Libya has never imposed any conditions on Chad or on any other country.

191. I have said from the beginning that there is a conspiracy and that Habré has been prompted to undertake this manoeuvre to pave the way—and here I am warning against operations that may be undertaken by imperialism in collusion with the Nemeiri régime and with Egypt, a party to the Camp David accords, against Libya.

192. I stated that Hissein Habré met Sharon. That meeting took place in the Hilton Hotel at Cairo, when Sharon was there. The inclusion of Egypt and Sudan in the list of speakers today affirms the manoeuvre and the conspiracy, as well as the fact that some of the statements were written for some delegations by well-known parties. What is the aim of this? Is it to pave the way for an act of aggression against Libya? We shall see in the near future.

193. I have been accused of obfuscating the issue and of going into a political discussion. What is the purpose of the Council: to discuss legal questions? Is it the International Court of Justice? Is it the Committee of Good Offices of the OAU? The Council is concerned with peace and security and discusses political issues in the first place and not legal issues.

194. This is a map prepared by the United Nations and on the basis of which Libya was granted its independence. The map was not prepared by Libya but by the United Nations. Let us see whether Aouzou forms part of Libya or not. As regards the agreements, the Laval-Mussolini Treaty is invalid and the Treaty of Ben Halim with France is valid. I do not want to go into the legal details, but the problem in Chad is a political one.

195. Thirty-two African States recognized the Goukouni Government. If I wanted to discuss the problem of Chad I would discuss it with the legitimate Goukouni Government and not with a group of mercenaries. I have never attempted, and I shall not do so, to change the course of the debate, but let us be clear: what is the function of the Council? Is it to discuss legal questions? Let the Council decide and then we shall discuss the documents which I already have. Then let us change the Security Council into an international court of justice and let it assume the functions of a court, or let it be turned into a good offices committee.

196. What I heard from the delegation of Sudan and from Egypt's Camp David delegation affirms the dimensions of the real conspiracy, and I feel that the Council must not be deceived. There is an Arab proverb which says: "If a rogue disparages me, that is eloquent proof of my lofty ideals."

197. Egypt, which sold Sinai to Israel and imperialism, is giving lessons in morality. It sold the whole of Egypt to Menachem Begin and now it is giving lectures on ethics. And to whom? To the Libyan revolution.

198. Egypt was the vanguard of the Arab nation. It was always the defender of Arab causes and Arab territories. Unfortunately it has changed and become a puppet entity. And let us of Africa and the Arab nation acknowledge that imperialism succeeded in recruiting puppets in the Sudan and Egypt.

199. Under what pretext does the representative of the Egyptian régime give lectures on ethics? The dimensions of this conspiracy are clear.

200. Libya respects the independence of Chad and its territorial integrity. It never has intervened and never will intervene in the internal affairs of Chad. But at the same time it respects its own borders and can protect its territory, and it will not give up an inch of its territory under any circumstances. We are willing to discuss any issue on a bilateral level, on an African level, on any level, to settle this problem, if there is a problem. But to the Egyptian régime and to the Sudanese régime I say that imperialism cannot protect them. What they have said does not represent their peoples: it represents Menachem Begin, Camp David and the friends of Camp David.

201. Revolutionary Libya will continue to defend its territories with all its might. We will not accept intervention in our affairs by any Power. Aouzou is part and parcel of Libya; Aouzou is Libyan territory. We inherited it from Italian colonialism. The Italian representative, who is now present, can be asked this question: when Libya was defeated, was Aouzou part of Libya or was it not? The United Kingdom and France are aware of the facts. We inherited Aouzou from Italian colonialism; its population is Libyan, and it is represented in the People's Conference. Whoever wants to fight Libya should not use these immoral means and manoeuvres. Libya is a signatory of the Cairo Agreement, and we respect all agreements.

202. I reserve my right to speak again, and I shall have a lot to say if the representatives of the Egyptian and Sudanese puppets or imperialism dare to speak of the Jamahiriya. As for what some other speakers said, I shall not even dignify their remarks with an answer.

203. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Sudan wishes to exercise his right of reply. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

204. Mr. ABDALLA (Sudan): Judging from the last words of the representative of Libya, Libya is a part of Africa. Throughout the history of the United Nations, Africa has observed a certain decorum and etiquette in dealing with this august international body. Speaking of African Presidents, whether the Chadian President, the Sudanese President or other Presidents in the manner in which the representative of Libya just addressed the Council is, to put it as mildly as I can, in bad taste.

205. The issue in question is the complaint by Chad, and Chad has given the Council its arguments. The Libyan representative has given very few arguments that deserved to be discussed and indulged in a lot of irrelevant talk about matters unrelated to the matter in question. I should like the Council to take note of that.

206. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Egypt has asked to speak in exercise of the right of reply. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

207. Mr. KHALIL (Egypt): Like the representative of Sudan I shall be very brief in view of the lateness of the

hour and what I consider to be the trivialities just pronounced by the representative of Libya. I think he always tends to see a conspiracy in any move; he tends to see the hand of what he thinks is imperialism; and I think that in his wild imagination he always indulges in insults to which we have unfortunately all become accustomed. I think our margin of tolerance perhaps goes beyond what the code of conduct of this august body should be.

208. As I have said, he seeks to cast doubt even on the representivity of my delegation. I noted some of the words and sentences he used, and I need not really bother the Council by replying to them. He said that Egypt is a party to Camp David. Yes, that is a fact. We are a party to Camp David. Camp David has sought and still seeks a comprehensive settlement in the Middle East. We stand by it. We hope it will be implemented. In fact I think it is much more practical than the empty rhetoric that is not getting us anywhere.

209. I do not intend to speak again whatever the representative of Libya might choose to say. Suffice it again to reiterate that I feel it is time that a certain code of conduct was enforced and respected in the Council.

210. The PRESIDENT: The representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya wishes to speak in exercise of the right of reply. I call upon him.

211. Mr. TREIKI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (*interpretation from Arabic*): I believe that the representatives of Egypt and the Sudan were cut to the quick by the facts. Nothing is more painful than reality. I am happy that the representative of Egypt recognizes that his country is a corner-stone of Camp David and that, proceeding from that premise, it implements Camp David.

212. That is all I wanted to say.

The meeting rose at 7.15 p.m.

NOTES

[1] United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 479, No. 6947.
[2] See A/36/534, annex II.
[3] See A/37/437, annex.
[4] See A/32/310, annex II, decision AHG/Dec.108 (XIV).
[5] See A/33/235 and Corr.1, annex II, resolution AHG/Res.94 (XV).

Litho in United Nations, New York 00400 60205—October 1990—2,050